A

LAPSE OF SOULS,

IN A STATE OF

PRE-EXISTENCE:

THE ONLY

ORIGINAL SIN, AND GROUND-WORK

OF THE

GOSPEL DISPENSATION:

BY CAPEL BERROW, A. M.

RECTOR OF ROSSINGTON, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

MAKE NOT IMPOSSIBLE THAT WHICH BUT SEEMS UNLIKE.——

SHAKESPEAR.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. DODSLEY, PALL-MALL.

C 1112.42
~~191.37~~
2
HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1864, June 1.

Bequest of

Convers Francis, D.D.

of Cambridge.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

A Pre-exiſtence of human ſouls, in which is implied a lapſe of thoſe ſouls in that ſtate of pre-exiſtence, the belief of the moſt learned and ingenious among the ancient philoſophers.

CHAP. II.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, deducible from ſome paſſages in holy writ.

CHAP. III.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls a branch of the Chriſtian theology, and the belief of many of the Greek and Latin fathers.

CHAP. IV.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, the belief of many eminent writers of a more modern date.

CHAP. V.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls deducible from the infelicities of man's preſent ſtate.

CHAP. VI.

A Pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls deducible from the general depravity of human nature.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. VII.

The article of the church of England concerning original ſin and the depravity of human nature conſidered and explained.

CHAP. VIII.

The Scripture account of the Fallen Angels illuſtrated and confirmed.

CHAP. IX.

Human Souls ſhewn to have been complicated and involved in the guilt of the fallen angels.

CHAP. X.

That lapſe *from original righteouſneſs the only original ſin, and the ground-work of the goſpel diſpenſation.*

CHAP. XI.

Objections to the above hypotheſis ſtated and removed.

CHAP. XII.

An application of the whole.

CHAP. I.

A Pre-exiſtence of human ſouls, in which is implied a lapſe of thoſe ſouls in that ſtate of pre-exiſtence, the belief of the moſt learned and ingenious among the antient philoſophers.

§ 1. THE original doctrine of pre-exiſtence included a ſuppoſed *lapſe* of human ſouls in a ſtate of pre-exiſtence: And as there is no hypotheſis in which Chriſtianity is, as I apprehend, ſo eſſentially intereſted, it gives me the higheſt pleaſure to find that it obtained in the earlieſt ages of the world, and met with an univerſal reception among men eminent for learning, ſpeculation, and philoſophic reaſoning.

§ 2. " Let us caſt our eyes, ſays Dr. Henry Moore, into what corner of the world we will, that has been famous for wiſdom and literature, and the wiſeſt of all nations you will find the aſſertors of the ſoul's pre-exiſtence. In Egypt, that antient nurſery of all ſciences, that this opinion was in vogue among the wiſeſt men there, thoſe fragments of Triſmegiſt's do ſufficiently witneſs: of which opinion not only the Gymnoſophiſts, and other wiſe men of Egypt were, but alſo the Brackmans of India, the Magi of Babylon and Perſia: to which may be added, the abſtruce philoſophy of the Jews, which they call the *Cabbala* of the ſoul's pre-exiſtence, and, if ſays he, we can believe the *Cabbala* of the Jews, we muſt aſſign it to Moſes: to whom we may add

Zoroaſter, Pythagoras, Epicharmus, Empedocles, Cebes, Euripides, Plato, Euclid, Philo, Virgil, Marcus, Cicero, Plotinus, Jamblicus, Proclus, Boethius, Pſellus* and ſeveral others."

§ 3. Quotations from each of the above-mentioned authors, could not be brought within the limits preſcribed to this work; the reader will therefore, I hope, be ſatisfied with knowing where to have recourſe for further information when he chooſes—

I ſhall proceed in the next place to point out to him ſome paſſages *in holy writ* from which a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls *ſeems* deducible.

---

* The reader will find not a *little* in favour of the doctrine in the works of Plato; and I wonder Dr. Moore ſhould omit ranking *Socrates* in his liſt of authorities, when, in that ſolemn diſcourſe with his friends, at the cloſe of which he took the cup of poiſon, he forced from *Simias* the following declaration: "By the moſt beautiful chain of reaſoning we are conſtrained, ſays he, to confeſs that our ſouls, and that within us, to which we owe our ideas of what is good and beautiful, exiſted before we were born.—πριν γενεσθαι ημας." See *Plato's Phædo.* Though not a *writer*, yet he was apparently a *teacher* of the doctrine of *pre-exiſtence.*

CHAP. II.

A pre-exiſtence &c. of human ſouls deducible from ſeveral paſſages in holy writ.

§ 1. IT has been matter of no ſmall concern to me to obſerve many paſſages in holy writ which, to the impartial eye, ſeem either diſtantly alluſive to, or poſitively declarative of a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls manifeſtly perverted by misjudging interpreters into a meaning quite foreign to the real truth. Among which is in the firſt place, the following paſſage, from Job. chap. xxxviii. v. 21.

God having queſtioned Job about the nature and place of light ſays, according to *our* tranſlation of the paſſage, which is a bad one—
Knoweſt thou it becauſe thou wert then born, or *becauſe the number of thy days is great?*

The meaning of which paſſage ſome underſtand to be this—" Thou wert not ſo much as " born, when I ſet a diſtinction between day " and night, between light and darkneſs. Thy " days had not then commenced. How then " canſt thou certainly know what was done be- " fore thou wert born?" Others again conſider the words thus—" Thou knoweſt it *for* thou waſt " then born, and for that the number of thy years " ſhould be great."

Similar to this is the interpretation which Junius and Tremellius put upon the paſſage.

" Noveris te jam tum natum fuiſſe, et numero " dies tuos eſſe multos.

" Know thou, or I would *have thee to know*, " that

" that thou waſt then born, or in *being*, and that " in number thy days are many."

§ 2. Another ſcriptural paſſage which may be urged in ſupport of this doctrine is, that ſaying of God to Jeremiah, *Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee, and before thou cameſt out of the womb I gave thee wiſdom.* Ch. i. v.

This paſſage, agreeably to the opinion of moſt commentators, contains nothing more than God's declaration to the prophet *Jeremiah*, that, before his entrance into the womb, he had fore-ordained him to the office, to which he was them called. In like manner as *Joſias*, *Cyrus*, *John the Baptiſt*, &c. were co-operating inſtruments *fore-ordained* by God, for the better carrying on the goſpel diſpenſation. But why muſt we neceſſarily ſuppoſe that all theſe were in *non-entity* at the time they were *pre-ordained* to their ſeparate offices? Or rather why ſhould we not conclude the very reverſe from even that very emphatical expreſſion——I *knew* thee, *agnovi te*, as rendered by *Junius* and *Tremellius*; which grammarians ſuppoſe to be, generally ſpeaking, applied to a perſon known *before*, and *then* actually exiſtent. Agnoſimus quos antea novimus—cognoſcimus quos nunquam prius vidimus.

§ 3. Another paſſage to the point is our Saviour's earneſt ejaculation to his father before his paſſion, in St. John ch. xvii. ver. 5.

And now, O Father glorify me with thine own glory, with the glory *which I had with thee* before the world was; which neceſſarily reſpects the *ſubordinate nature*, and *glory*, as his *ſupreme glorification* could never have departed from him.

§ 4. To the above may be added the anſwer which the diſciples gave to our Saviour's demand —whom men ſaid that he was—Some ſay that thou

thou art *John* the *Baptiſt*, ſome *Elias* or one of the prophets. A ſufficient demonſtration this, that a deſcent of the human ſpecies upon earth, from a *prior ſtate*, was a prevailing opinion among the Jews at that time, which our Saviour ſeemed rather to acquieſce in than object to, by only aſking them in return—*But whom ſay* ye *that I am?*

§ 5. And the ſame obſervation may be made on that queſtion put to our Saviour concerning the blind man: *Maſter, was it for this man's ſin or his parents that he was born blind?*——A queſtion which our Saviour did not we find take upon him to reprove, which undoubtedly he would have done, had it ſeemed to him to ſavour of a doctrine falſe and frivolous. Our Saviour's anſwer is, "*Neither hath this man ſinned, nor his parents*—but that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him. Which he ſaid (according to the opinion of ſome, whom I eſteem the beſt commentators on the ſcriptures extant) not (απλως) ſimply; for ſo, both he and his parents *had* ſinned (as St. Chryſoſtom notes) but that neither *this* man's ſin, nor his *Parents* were the cauſe why *he* in particular ſhould be born blind, but that God's glory might appear in his cure. See aſſembly of divines Annot. printed 1623.

§ 6. To the above let me add the following declaration of the author of the book of Wiſdom. Yea rather being good (comparatively ſo he means) "I came into a body undefiled." Wiſdom. ch. viii. ver. 20. Wherein he manifeſtly declares himſelf to have been a *moral agent* in a ſtate prior to his abode *here.*

§ 7. But what ſeems more home to the point ſtill, is our *Saviour*'s declaration, that John the Baptiſt had actually pre-exiſted in the perſon of Elias

Elias or Elijah. *His diſciples aſk him* (Jeſus) *ſaying, why then ſay the ſcribes that Elias muſt firſt come? And Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto them, Elias ſhall truly firſt come and reſtore all things. But I ſay unto you, that Elias* is come already, *and they knew him not, and have done unto him whatſoever they liſted, likewiſe alſo ſhall the ſon of man ſuffer of them. Then the diſciples* knew that he ſpake unto them of John the Baptiſt. Mat. ch. xvii. 10. And ſo great was the reſemblance between the Elias of the Old Teſtament, and that of the New, in point of circumſtances and ſituation of life, and ſo equally adapted thereto were the ſpirit and tenor of their minds, that there is no doubt I think but that one and the ſame ſoul animated at two different periods of time two different corporeal vehicles. They were both born, as a learned commentator obſerves, (Burket) in bad times, they were both zealous for God and religion; they were both undaunted reprovers of the faults of princes, and they were both hated and implacably perſecuted on that account.

§ 8. That the above paſſages, if not poſitive declarations of, are, however, tranſient glances at a pre-exiſtence, &c. of the human ſoul, the reader will, I apprehend, find more and more reaſon to conclude as he goes along.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls a branch of the Chriſtian theology, and the belief of many of the Greek and Latin fathers.

§ 1 I Have long ſince made this obſervation, ſays Mr. Brokleſby, that there is ſcarce a truly pious book written touching matters of the Chriſtian theology, wherein the *pre-exiſtence of human ſouls* is not either implicitly or in expreſs words acknowledged, although it is intentionally no aſſertor of it *. Of the truth of which obſervation he produces a number of

* This Mr. Brockleſby was a man of moſt prodigious reading, and of an uncommon ſhare of penetration in matters relative to the Chriſtian theology. Singular indeed he is in his opinions, and often ſingular, and ſeemingly uncouth, at firſt ſight, in his phraſeology, owing to a *reach* of ſentiment not to be expreſſed by *common* language. He is emphatical, and greatly ſo, but not elegant. He deals not in that kind of elegance (the only captivating ſort of compoſition now) which carries the admiring reader ſo glibly, ſo ſmoothly, ſo enchantingly on the glaſſy ſurface of a gently flowing—*nothing*. It is not to be wondered therefore, that a work of this great man, the fruit, as he expreſſes himſelf, "of much time, and thought, of anxious contemplation and great labour," though abounding with ſpeculations of the utmoſt importance (if matters relative to the goſpel diſpenſation may be deemed ſuch) is ſcarce to be met with but under a load of uſeleſs lumber. The work to which I allude---is *An Explication of the Goſpel Theiſm, and the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion, concerning the true Account of the Syſtem of the univerſe, and of the chriſtian Trinity, Printed* 1706. *Large Folio.* A work to which I am greatly indebted for references to authors who have wrote on the doctrine of pre-exiſtence; from whom, together with thoſe extracts which I have myſelf made, I have given the reader many as they lie in Mr. Brokleſby's page.

inſtances ſufficient to ſhew that a pre-exiſtence, of human ſouls may be accounted a branch of the Chriſtian theology.

§ 2. The antient writers of the church, attribute a celeſtial and divine condition to Adam in his innocency, as appears from their ſuppoſing him to have been firſt formed in the utmoſt perfection. And by their repreſenting the ſoul of man as lapſed from a dignity and purity of ſoul truly celeſtial, they muſt neceſſarily conclude that it took its origin from a celeſtial ſtate.

And in this they agreed with the Pagan theologers, who thought it an indignity to the ſoul, to conſider it as deriving its exiſtence from the earth—Their maxim was, that our ſouls were brought from heaven and return thither again.—that not any of them were formed upon earth *.

In *alluſion* to which opinion ſpeaks Lucretius†.

§ 3. The ſoul, ſays Lactantius, could not have poſſeſſed ſo much ſagacity, could not have been able to exert itſelf with ſo much energy and adroitneſs, had it not taken its riſe from Heaven‖.

§ 4. The ſoul is then, ſays Mr. Farrendon, moſt herſelf and cometh nigheſt to her former ſtate, when forgetting the weight and hindrance of the body, ſhe enjoys herſelf, takes wings, as it

---

* Noſtras animas deduci e Cælo, redire in Cælum——animorum nulla in terris origo inveniri poteſt. Cicero.

† Deniq; cæleſti ſumus omnes ſemine oriundi---
---Cedit item retro de terra, quod fuit ante
In terras; & quod miſſum'ſt ex etheris oris,
Id rurſum Cæli rellatum templa receptant.
Lucretius lib. 2.

‖ Nec enim tantam poſſet habere ſolertiam, tantam Vim, tantam celeritatem, niſi Originem traheret e Cælo. Lact. de divin. Prem. lib. 7.

it were, and ſoars up in the contemplation of God and his goodneſs, when ſhe begins to be that which ſhe muſt needs believe herſelf to be, of a celeſtial and heavenly beginning*.

§ 5. Do we not, ſays Arnobius, owe this in the firſt place to God that we are what we *are*, are called *men*, and that, deſcending hither by either an *actual expulſion* from his preſence, or *naturally* in conſequence of a prior *lapſe*, we are detained in this *darkſome* habitation the body†.

And that our deſcent from heaven was conſidered by chriſtian writers as having been preceded by ſome pre-exiſtent duration and habitation with the celeſtial inhabitants, we muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe, or they were at very unneceſſary pains to prove what none but Atheiſts will deny---that the ſoul of man ſprung from God—But to return.

§ 6. How, ſays St. Auguſtine, is the love of our country revived in us, which we had forgot by a long perigrination? And again, ſays he, heaven is our country, which, perhaps, by a long perigrination we have forgot‖.

§ 7 Chriſtians, ſays another Chriſtian writer, are invited to the delights of Paradiſe, and to all the regenerate, a return is opened to their loſt country*.

And the ſecond petition of our Lord's pray-

---

* See Farrendon's ſermon on Epheſ. v. 1.

† Nonne huic (Deo) omnes debemus hoc ipſum primum quod ſumus? quod eſſe homines dicimur quod, ab eo, vel miſſi vel lapſi, *cæcitate* hujus corporis continemur? Arnob. Advers gent. Lib. 1.

‖ Quomodo in nobis reformetur amor civitatis noſtræ quam diuturna peregrinatione obliti fuerimus. *Amen* Illa eſt Patria noſtra quam longa fortaſſe perigrinatione obliti ſumus. St. Aug. in Pſal. xxxii.

(thy kingdom come) conſtrains us to confeſs, ſays Luther (apud Hornbek) with our own mouths, the ſad calamity of our baniſhment from Heaven.

§ 8. And a divine of our own, Dr. Edes, concerning the original and preſent ſtate of man, ſays as follows. His being in the world is but a kind of being in the wilderneſs, wherein he is eſtranged from the city of the living God. Agreeably to which ſays the apoſtle to the Epheſians---I beſeech you brethren as *ſtrangers* and *pilgrims*, that ye abſtain from fleſhly luſts, &c. Again ſays another writer, having looſed the bonds of death, he, viz. Chriſt, opened the way to our heavenly country, from which all mankind had been baniſhed many thouſand years. We are caſt from an high. ſays the ſame writer, into the ſink of this world †. And we are, ſays St. Baſil, by ſin fallen to the earth ‡.

§ 9 Man! ſays St. Chryſoſtom, thou art a ſtranger. a foreigner here, your country is Heaven, thither remit your treaſure ‖.

§ 10. Chriſt, ſays St. Chryſoſtom, leads us again into Heaven *—giving us undoubtedly to underſtand that we had been there before.

§ 11. It is the firm perſuaſion, ſays Grotius, of the ancient fathers, that the ſouls of men were

---

* Invitatur ad paradiſi delicias populus Chriſtianus, et cunctis regeneratis ad amiſſam patriam patefefac eſt reditus, Leo. M. de Paſſion. dom. ſer. 13.

† Laurent Surii Homil. p. 379. in Die Paſchæ.

‡ Δια της αμαρτιας κατἀρρυημεν.
St. Baſil. de Spirit. ſanct.

‖ ξενος εις και παραπεδημος των ενταυθα, πατριδα εχεις εν ὑρανιοις, ταυτα εχει μεταβες. Chryſoſt. ad Prop. Antioch Homil. 2.

* χριστος εις τον ὑρανον ημας δι αυτε παλιν εισηγαγε. Chryſoſt. Hom. de S. S. Martyr.

were originally poſſeſſed of the divine image; which now they have loſt, and that their regeneration is a reduction thereto. Greg. Nazianzen ſays, that the ſoul is of God, and divine, and partakes of the ſupernal nobility, which is alſo her ancient nobility. Orat i. p. 8.

§ 12. She is of God, ſays St. Chryſoſtom, not only in the general way as all beings are of God, their creator, nor only as being of more than human original (God being peculiarly the father of ſouls and ſpirits) but it ſhe was originally poſſeſſed of the divine image, ſhe was of God as iſſuing from paternal ſanctity. St Chryſoſtom. viii. p. 145. All men, ſays Grotius, were from their birth *ſons of God*, but they loſt that privilege by *alienating* themſelves from him. See Grotius on the parable of the Prodigal Son.

§ 13. The ſouls of all men were divinely virtuous in their original creation; nor have they ſo totally loſt the divine image but that there are, as St. Aug. ſays, the feeble remains, the weak relicks of the image of God, the *Rudera* or broken pieces of our firſt building. St. Aug. de Spirit. & Lib. vi. 28. And Maximus the martyr ſays, that the deſign of Chriſt's incarnation, was to make us partakers of a divine nature, ως απ αρχης as in the beginning.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, the belief of many eminent writers of a more modern date.

§ 1. AMONG thoſe writers of a more modern date, who have eſpouſed the doctrine of a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, there is (as we have ſeen above p. 12.) the great Dr. Henry Moore—his ingenious and learned diſciple Mr. Glanville*, the ſagacious Dr. Cheyne† and that very learned and ingenious divine Dr. Butler, the late Biſhop of Durham‡.

§ 2. To the above may be added ſome letters in the Turkiſh Spy, and ſome papers, if I miſ-

* Vid. Mr. Glanvile's Lux Orientalis, in which the ſubject is conſidered ſo copiouſly as to have left room for little or nothing new to be added, excepting what ariſes from its being conſidered as the ground-work of the goſpel diſpenſation'.

† I ſhall have occaſion to mention this author more than once as I go along.

‡ There are, ſays he, natural appearances of our being in a ſtate of degeneration---ſee his Anal. p. 111. and again, p. 297, 298. Whoever will conſider the manifold miſeries and even extreme wickedneſs of the world, that the beſt have great wrongneſſes within themſelves, which they complain of and endeavour to amend, but that the generality grow proffligate and corrupt with age; that heatheniſh moraliſts thought the preſent to be a ſtate of puniſhment; and what might be added, that the earth our habitation, has the appearance of being a ruin; whoever, I ſay, will conſider all theſe and ſome other obvious things, will think he has little reaſon to object againſt the ſcripture account, that mankind is in a ſtate of degradation; againſt this being the fact how difficult ſoever he may think it to account for or even to *form a diſtinct conception of the reaſons and circumſtances of it.*

take

take not, in the Rambler. But, together with Dr. Henry Moore, and Mr. Glanville, I would in a particular manner recommend to the reader's peruſal the following tracts—A Letter of Reſolutions, concerning Origen and the chiefeſt of his Opinions, printed 1661--- a ſcarce, but moſt valuable work---Dr. Henry Moore's Philoſophical Poems---The Chevalier Ramſay's Philoſophical Principles *. And a very curious little tract intitled, The New Practice of Piety, wrote in imitation of Dr. Brown's Religio Medici, and by one of the Authors of the Athenian Oracle. Printed 1704.

Theſe are the principal advocates for the doctrine of a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, to the want of a peruſal of which it is owing, I imagine, that ſo many in the world are ſo unreaſonably, and ſo *unmeaningly* prejudiced againſt it.

But that I may not detain the reader too long with *authorities*, I ſhall cloſe this chapter with the two following extracts; the one from the great Dr. Iſaac Barrow, and the other from our incomparable Brokleſby.

§ 3. Thoſe Perſons, ſays Dr. Barrow, who for offences wide of malice, were detained in the City of Refuge (among the Jews) and prohibited to return home until the death of the high prieſt, were afterwardsreſtored to the land of their poſ-

---

* Though I have the pleaſure to find that this ingenious writer is firmly perſuaded that human ſouls did pre-exiſt, yet we differ in opinion as to the time and place of that ſuppoſed pre-exiſtence. I ſuppoſe it to have commenced above, the learned writer fixes it to Adam's Paradiſaical ſtate.

ſeſſion; whereby was intimated, that until after our Saviour's death, no man could *return* into Paradiſe his *primitive home*, from which man for his ſin had been *excluded*; but that thenceforth all perſons in an evangelical account not malicious or wicked, had a right to *return thither*. Barrow Serm. 31, on Mark xvi. 19.

§ 4. And we applaud, ſays Brockleſby, thoſe ſayings of the fathers, which affirm that the intent of Chriſt's coming was our *reſtauration*, but not ſuch as ſeem to affirm that the intent of Chriſt's coming was nothing more than to repair the fall of Adam in his *terreſtrial* paradiſe---that we may regain in Chriſt, that which we had loſt in Adam, the image and ſimilitude of God---that by the œconomy of the tree, we might regain that which we had negligently loſt by the tree---that what was loſt of old in Adam by the tree, might be reſtored by the Tree of Chriſt's paſſion. Iren. adv. Hor. L. 3. C. 20. ibid L. 5. Tertul. adv. Jud. C. 13---but, ſays he, if it be a reſtauration, it muſt be counted more than a reſtauration of what was before a heavenly ſtate, and an heavenly world of ſouls muſt be pre-exiſtent, this *preſent* world of rationals muſt be made out of the ruins of the *heavenly* world. Brokleſby, p. 509.

§ 5. Having now done with references to, and quotations from authors ancient and modern, who have wrote in favour of a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, I ſhall proceed to offer to the reader's conſideration a few arguments in farther ſupport of that doctrine ariſing from the nature and circumſtances of our abode here; which, if urged before in ſome degree by others, will be found to be placed in a new, and with reſpect to ſome of them in, perhaps, a more ſtriking light.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

A pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls deduccible from man's preſent infelicities.

§ 1. THAT infinite benevolence is as eſſential to the nature of the divine Being, as infinite juſtice, wiſdom, and power, I conſider as a truth equally obvious as is that of his exiſtence, nor can I conceive it more natural and eſſential to the ſun to give warmth than for the Deity, when calling creatures into a rational exiſtence to impart to them inſtant happineſs. The very reverſe of which idea of the Creator is implied in the ſuppoſal that the preſent is the firſt ſtate of exiſtence in which we have made our appearance*. We are born to troubles as the ſparks fly upwards. We ſuck in miſery with our mother's milk, and the very firſt point of knowledge at which we are enabled to arrive, is to know what ſorrow meaneth. Thoſe piercing cries, with which the new-born babe ſalutes the opening world, how do they eccho forth an inward grief? How reluctantly does it meet its enlargement from the impriſoning womb, as if conſcious that it was a paſſage only to a place of puniſhment? How like an outcaſt of heaven afterwards is the helpleſs infant, "mewling and puking in his nurſe's arms!" Its mental faculties how inept are they and inactive! Its organic powers how inert and languid! Call you this an original, and the painter

* Conſider this life ſays St. Chryſoſtom, and you'll find it compounded of nought but tears, obliquy, revilings, ſorrow, negligences, labour, ſickneſs, old age, ſin and death—Συνοησον οτι ουδεν εχει ο Βιος ει μη δακρυα και ονειδη και λοιδοριας και αθυμιας και ολιγωριας και πονους και νοσους και γηρας και αμαρτιας και Θανατον.

God? But where then are the finiſhings worthy the hand of the divine maſter? Where thoſe exalted breathings of a freſh-formed ſoul, reaſon, reflection, active purity? Where the open ever-ſmiling countenance and eyes, that beam forth the glowing happineſs within? Theſe, what but theſe can be the genuine lineaments of a true image of God? But can we find them even in miniature, in infant man? Alas! no. Whence then ſo imperfect and unfiniſhed a piece? Is it not an original? And the artiſt was it not God? Yes. But who does not ſee that it is an original terribly damaged? Faded every beauty, every feature marred!

§ 2. If now from this unpleaſing picture of man in his *infant* ſtate we proceed to trace him through the other progreſſive ſtages of life, how unpleaſing and uncomfortable an appearance does he ſtill make? Youth has its thouſand croſſes and diſappointments. And the trifling pleaſures which in that ſeaſon of giddineſs and folly captivate and amuſe for a while, are more than over-balanced by the occurrence of ſome *ſhadowy* grievances and diſtreſſes that ſit upon the mind with a weight equal to *ſubſtantial* ones. Inſtruction is a tax upon the youth's diverſions, not to be endured, and reſtraint of any kind, however ſeaſonable, is a ſeverity not to be born, and till he can *ruin* himſelf in *his own way*, he is quite unhappy.

§ 3. View now this offspring of providence ripened at length into man, and how does it fare with him then? Why then his former *follies* are exchanged for flagrant *vices*, and his *imaginary* troubles and misfortunes removed for the acceſſion of ſuch as are *real*. And ſhould even prudence, piety, and virtue be the governing principles of his after-life, yet what

preca-

precarious preſervatives are theſe againſt calamities! The good and bad, alas! ſhare them more or leſs indiſcriminately. Preſuming therefore, that the Deity could not but communicate happineſs to all his intellectual creatures, at the very inſtant that he conferred on them life: I infer from the above retroſpect into man's ſtate from his birth, that he muſt have experienced a vital exiſtence *prior* to this *, and a lapſe from original righteouſneſs in that prior ſtate.

§ 4. If it be urged that this ſuppoſed *firſt* will not be the *laſt* ſtage of man's exiſtence, and that therefore it is eaſy to conceive how the defects, inconveniencies, diſorders and calamities, under which he now labours, will be removed in a *ſtate to come*, and that if he is made miſerable as ſcripture informs us he is, through the default of *one*, he will be there ſufficiently rewarded for that miſery by the all-ſufficient merits of *another*: what is this but inverting the idea of divine Providence, and ſuppoſing God to *end* only with man in a manner with which we would rather expect he would begin, and as one who *delighteth* not more *in mercy*, than in his creatures miſery?

§ 5. Can the God of infinite rectitude and goodneſs view with an eye of *indignation* creatures juſt ſtarting into a rational exiſtence, by the

---

* If all is not deceit and illuſion it muſt be evident to a demonſtration, that nothing unhappy in its order can come out of the hands of infinite goodneſs; and yet it is fact that all ſentient and intelligent beings here are univerſally more or leſs miſerable, and that there never was any human creature in his right ſenſes, which in a whole duration of human life, felt not and thought not himſelf unhappy and miſerable for ſome time, if not for the moſt part of his rational life, and wiſhed not himſelf earneſtly better, wiſer and more happy. Vid. Dr. Cheyne's Diſcourſes, p. 30, 31.

power of his almighty *fiat!*—And for no crime? No crime? Ay for no crime. For can creatures previouſly to the power of acting *at all*, commit crimes? And to ſuffer for the offence of another is to ſuffer wrongfully. Such therefore cannot be the will of God towards man. If man then comes, which undoubtedly he does, as a *ſuffering* creature *here*, muſt he not have rendered himſelf *obnoxious* to ſuch *ſufferings* by ſome *prior treſpaſſes?* But this is a point which will be more fully conſidered hereafter.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

A Pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls deducible from the general depravity of human nature.

§ 1. HOW great the depravity of human nature is, ſcripture, and the experience of paſt ages as well as the preſent, abundantly evince.

§ 2. With reſpect to the former, take for the preſent the two or three following paſſages only.

Who might offend and hath not offended? Or done evil and hath not done it?

O *Jeruſalem*, ſays the prophet *Jeremiah*, *waſh thine heart from wickedneſs that thou mayeſt be ſaved, how long ſhall thy vain thoughts lodge within thee?*

Again ſays he, *The heart is deceitful above all things and deſperately wicked, who can know it?*

The Lord knoweth the thoughts of men that they are but vain, ſays the Pſalmiſt.

Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, adultery, fornication, theft, &c. ſays our Saviour.

And again, *We are*, ſays the apoſtle, *by nature the children of wrath.*

§ 3. If from ſcripture we turn to experience, what abundant evidence have we of the depravity of man's nature, from thoſe ſtrong propenſions to evil, diſcoverable, more or leſs in all of us, as ſoon after our firſt entance into life as we are at all capable of acting in it. Man, froward man, longs to go aſtray from his very cradle, and were his infant efforts not reſtrained by the occaſional reaſonings, rewards or corrections of the watchful parent, what crimes would he not deviſe?

What

What enormities would he not perpetrate? To what follies would he not become enſlaved? Inſomuch that *nature* who ſhould ſeem firſt entitled to the guardianſhip of her own offſpring, is the very laſt to whom we would entruſt the important charge. A truth which every *ſyſtem of morality* ſuggeſts, and *education* implies. The end and deſign of which is not only to ſtrengthen, invigorate, and enrich a weak, languid and barren *underſtanding*, but alſo to correct and reform a vicious and corrupt *will*.

§ 4. The firſt dawnings of ſenſe and reflection in the infant's mind diſcover ſome upriſing paſſion or affection, ſome young diſeaſe, which as the poet ſays,

> Grows with his growth, and ſtrengthens with his ſtrength;

is alike conſtitutional to the ſoul, as maladies of various kinds are to the body*. And as, from its natural or acquired temperature, the latter becomes more or leſs ſuſceptible of infection from a peſtilent air, or other noxious influencies from without; ſo fares it evidently with the former. A kind of conſtitution there is in the *ſouls* of men, as well as in their bodies, which, though not equally bad in ſome as in others, is more or leſs diſeaſed in all. And proportionably to the difference obſervable in this conſtitutional frame of ſouls in different men, we ſee them excited to different ſorts of gratifications, and varying from

---

* Nam vitiis nemo ſine naſcitur, ille eſt
Qui minimis urgetur———

Hor. Sat. 3. lib. 1.

each

each other as much in their paſſions as in their perſons, or choice of food *.

§ 4. So that whilſt certain objects work upon the fancy of ſome, with a force and energy too powerful for human means alone to repel, they operate feebly, or not at all perhaps on others. When attracted therefore by ſuch as are congruous to a *peculiar* turn of affection, a man commits crimes *enormouſly deteſtable*; the reflecting part of the world will not fail heartily to pity the offender, at the ſame time that they think it neceſſary to puniſh the offence, and will conſider it rather as a matter of *good fortune*, than any kind of *merit* in themſelves or others, that they ſtand exempt from tranſgreſſions for which they have no degree of reliſh, which take not their riſe from either bad precepts or bad examples, but grow ſpontaneouſly as it were from nature.

Bad precepts and bad examples do indeed too frequently influence men to the practice of common crimes; evil counſel adminiſtered with ſkill, may enſnare a weak aſſociate into theft, or fornication or adultery. *When he ſeeth a thief, he may conſent unto him, and be partaker with the adulterer*, and as *Shakeſpear* ſays,

---

* ——————Quemvis mediâ erue turbâ
Aut ob avaritiam, aut miſerâ ambitione laborat.
Hic nuptarum inſanit amoribus, hic puerorum,
Hunc capit argenti ſplendor; ſtupet Albius ære;
Hic mutat merces ſurgente a ſole, ad eum quo
Veſpertina tepet regio, quin per mala præceps
Fertur, uti pulvis collectus turbine, ne quid
Summa deperdat metuens, aut ampliet ut rem.
Hor. Sat. 4. lib. 1.

Who

" Who ſo firm that cannot be ſeduced*?"

But thoſe affections of the mind to which I here alude, and from which is proveable man's depravity of nature, are not capable of being inſtilled, any more than they are of being diſpelled by advice, authority or example, and theſe, [not to mention thoſe *preternatural* propenſities ſo unhappily ariſing in the breaſts of ſome,] are envy, malice, cruelty, revenge, covetouſneſs, ambition, pride, ſubtilty, craft, deceit. Where any of theſe take place, there nature herſelf gives the ſettlement†.

§ 5. And

---

* Julius Cæſar. Warburton, p. 16.—where the power of advice, however pernicious, is ſtrongly painted.

Well, Brutus, ſays his fellow-conſpirator Caſſius [Brutus gone]

———Thou art noble; yet I ſee
Thy honourable metal may be wrought upon
From what it is diſpoſed; therefore 'tis meet,
That noble minds keep ever with their likes,
For who ſo firm as cannot be ſeduced?

† The very ingenious Dr. Baker, in his treatiſe De Affectibus Animi, has a paſſage ſo fully illuſtrative of my meaning, that I could not help giving it an Engliſh dreſs.

This paſſion ſays he, (ſpeaking of envy) is the moſt troubleſome inmate of the human heart, it is an inteſtine plague, diffuſing its poiſonous influence through the whole maſs of blood and juices,

Sucks up the marrow from the ſolid bone,
Nor leaves within the limbs one drop of blood.

And, ſtrange as it may appear, yet is it, notwithſtanding, true from known facts, that ſymptoms of envy appear in the infant ſtate of man from his very cradle.—Inſomuch that it is not unuſual to ſee a babe pining and languiſhing in a moſt wretched manner with this paſſion, as with a conſumptive malady. Nor is it capable of being freed from the overpowering diſorder by any medical art or aſſiſtance whatever, but by either a total removal, or a pretended flight of the infant rival.

Hæc

§ 5. And what character is there in public life, or among thoſe in a more private ſphere of action, either *amiable* or *great*, that is not ſullied by an unlucky intermixture of one or other of nature's foibles, if not flagrant vices.

§ 6. *Agriophilus* and *Philanthropus* are men whoſe lives form an entire contraſt. In the one you have what is completely odious and deteſtable in the general eſtimation of the world; in the other the truly amiable and engaging. And yet it is remarkable, that in that particular courſe of behaviour, wherein *Philanthropus* differs moſt from the temper and conduct of *Agriophilus*, he is moſt reprehenſible.

Agriophilus is moroſe, covetous, cruel, and revengeful; *Philanthropus* quite the reverſe; he is affable, generous, tender-hearted, compaſſionate. But how does it grieve one to ſee theſe, and many other ſhining virtues obſcured at once by one ſingle foible of nature,—indiſcretion? A frailty, which accompanied him from his earlieſt life. *Agriophilus* is *covetous*, *Philanthropus* is *extravagant*. *Agriophilus* hides himſelf from the world, as loving no part of it but that from which he can make a thirty, forty, or an hundred *per cent.* ad-

---

Hæc eſt hoſpes (nempe invidia) humani pectoris moleſtiſſima; hæc inteſtina peſtis, quæ ſanguine, humoribuſque noſtris malum ſuum immiſcet virus; quæ

Intactis vorat oſſibus medullas,
Et totum bibit artubus cruorem.

Etiam in tenellâ hominis ætate, ipſiſque ab incunabulis (mirum eſt quod dicturus ſum, at experientiâ ſatis pervulgatum) produnt ſe haud obſcura quædam zelotypiæ ſigna; ita ut infantulum videre liceat ex hoc affectu tabe miſerrimè extenuari, ac langueſcere; non niſi rivali infantulo aut amoto oculis, aut magis de induſtriâ neglecto, arte ullâ, aut auxilio medicorum a gravi morbo liberandum. Vid. D. Baker de Affect. Anim. &c. p. 23, 24.

vantage. *Philanthropus*, on the contrary, holding ſuch a mean, low-ſpirited mind in the utmoſt contempt, runs into a culpable negligence in his affairs, and a too exceſſive fondneſs for friendſhips, popularity, and vain applauſe. But is it not wonderful, that two ſuch contraſted diſpoſitions ſhould exiſt in men whoſe ſituation and circumſtances in life give them opportunities of acting entirely the ſame part in it? *Agriophilus* has as much money to ſquander away as *Philanthropus* ever poſſeſſed; but he would not, if he could help it, part with a ſhilling; and *Philanthropus* could have availed himſelf of as many powerful pleas for œconomy and frugality as *Agriophilus*, and would *have ſo done* had he ever been directed by *prudence*. But how ſhall we account for a *diſſonancy* of principles and propenſions in theſe two; a diſſonancy as great as if it exiſted in beings of a different ſpecies? Is it reſolvable all into the force of example, advice, or ſolicitation? Certainly no. For the one is as univerſally deſpiſed for his inſenſibility and brutality, and he knows it, as the other is condemned for his gaiety and indiſcretion. To what, in ſhort, but a diſſimilarity of *taſte* alone can we aſcribe the extraordinary difference? Taſte, which makes as well the *moral man*, as the *muſician*, *painter*, or *poet*. It is taſte, the ſoul's conſtitutional frame I mean, that makes the man; and you may as eaſily whip one lad at ſchool into a nice and exquiſite reliſh for muſic, painting, poetry, or other arts, as give another, by the uſe of the beſt methods you can deviſe, a nice and delicate turn for honour, integrity, and public ſpirit. And it is notorious what very different effects ariſe frequently from the ſame courſe of diſcipline, in general, the ſame ſalutary precepts, patterns, and examples, in two or more youths, the offſpring

of

of the ſame parents. How amazingly different very often are their tempers, genius, paſſions, inclinations, purſuits * ?

§ 7. And yet I would not be thought to aſſert, that that which we here call taſte, that predominant, conſtitutional *turn* of mind, with which each man comes into the world *irreſiſtibly*, and by a kind of *fatality*, determines him to his peculiar purſuits. For, generally ſpeaking, its influence either leſſens, or is encreaſed in proportion to the encouragement or checks it may occaſionally meet with, in the courſe of a well or ill-conducted education. The former will do wonders in breaking or weakning the force of many paſſions, which too uſually rage in the juvenile mind, with double force, by means of the latter; and yet that there are ſome which by the uſe of meer natural powers are irremoveable, no one will deny, who conſiders in the leaſt what human nature in general *is*, and always *has been* †.

 § 8. Nor

---

* " Cur alter fratrum ceſſare, et ludere, et ungi,
" Præferat Herodis palmetis pinguibus ; alter
" Sylveſtrem flammis, et ferro mitiget agrum :
" Scit genius, natale comes, qui temperat aſtrum,
" Naturæ deus humanæ."——

By the term Genius, Horace means the natural turn, diſpoſition or ſpirit of a man, and it is called the Deus humanæ naturæ, as being that which gives life and activity to the whole intellectual frame.

" Le gene, ſays madam Dacier, qui préſide à la naiſſance
" de tous les hommes, et qui etant different, fit la difference
" des inclinations, et des temperans. Ce genie n'eſt autre
" choſe, que leur eſprit." Dacier in loco.

† It is inconceivable, ſays a French writer, that the curious obſervers of nature, men who bend their utmoſt application upon ſtudying and knowing themſelves, ſhould not have obſerved, that man is not governed and conducted by reaſon—that reaſon, with all its power and induſtry, cannot deſtroy any one

§ 8. Nor would the argument for the ſoul's depravity be at all weakened, ſhould it be inſiſted on,

---

one paſſion that is rooted in the heart of man, neither by the help of age nor by the influence of example, nor by the fear of evil. Vid. l'Eſprit's preface to his deceit of human virtues.

And ſays Seneca: " Nullâ ſapientiâ naturalia corporis, aut " animi vitia ponuntur, quicquid ingenitum eſt lenitur arte, " non vincitur." Senec. Epiſt.

" It is more eaſy, ſays an old poet, to give life and education to a man, than to impart to him a rightly-diſpoſed " mind; to which not one has attended, as yet, who has aimed " to make a wiſe man of a fool, or a good man out of a bad " one. If the deity had given to the Æſculapian tribe the art " of correcting and removing the peccant and malignant humours of the mind, many and great would have been their " fees. But if the νοημα of a man--his leading principle--was " any thing capable of being framed or implanted, that never " would have proved in the end a bad man, who had liſtened " to the wholſome preſcripts of a good father. But be your " precepts what they may, it will never be in your power to " make a bad man a good one."

Φυσαι κ᾽ θρεψαι ραον βροτον η φρενας εσθλας᾽
Ενθεμεν. ουδεις πω τουτο γ επιφρασατο,
Οστις σωφρον εθηκε τον αφρονα, κ᾽ κακον εσθλον.
Ει δ᾽ Ασκληπιαδαις τουτο εδωκε θεος,
Πασθαι κακοτητα, κ᾽ ατηρας φρενας ανδρων,
πολλους αν μισθους, κ᾽ μεγαλας εφερον.
Ει δ᾽ ην ποιητον τε κ᾽ ἐνθετον ανδρι νοημα,
ἑποτ αν εξ αγαθου πατρος εγεντο κακος
πειθομενος μυθοισι σαοφροσιν Αλλα διδασκων
Φυσοτε ποιησεις τον κακον ανδρ αγαθον.

Θεογ. γνωμ. l. 429.

This paſſage, which I have taken upon me to tranſlate, the reader is deſired to attend to with proper caution, and not to forget that it comes from the pen of an heathen moraliſt, unacquainted, of courſe, with thoſe all ſufficient reſources for the ſuppreſſion of thoſe bad paſſions, to which Chriſtians are directed, and from which they may, if they are not wanting to themſelves, reap the deſired advantage. And it is introduced here in proof, or illuſtration of this one obvious truth only, that man comes into the world naturally bad.

I would not however be underſtood to mean, from what has here been advanced, that no one either does, or ever did come into

on, or could it be even proved that her vices or frailties are propagated among men, by either the influence of bad example, or by an incogitant neglect, or groſs perverſion of right reaſon; ſince in the firſt place, bad examples preſuppoſe a vitioſity of mind in thoſe who at firſt ſet the examples; and from the reſiſtance and oppoſition, which in various inſtances they are found to meet with in ſome, it may reaſonably be preſumed, that they

---

into this world altogether uninfected with vicious principles and propenſions; the reverſe having been evidently the caſe, as may be abundantly proved as well from hiſtory, ſacred and profane, as alſo from even the preſent times; but only that, generally ſpeaking, man has at the beſt, and under the advantages of education, interwoven with his virtues many natural frailties, imperfections, not to ſay immoralities.

As to the exalted examples of piety and virtue, recorded either in ſacred hiſtory or profane, or of what even the preſent times may be thought to boaſt, theſe, when compared with the bulk of mankind in general, (not to mention the more than ordinary powers, with which moſt, if not all of the former, came furniſhed, that they might become exemplary patterns of purity and holineſs to a wicked and degenerate world (*a*).) theſe, I ſay, are inſtances ſo ſeemingly ſingular and extraordinary, as do not in the leaſt diſprove, what only I would be underſtood to aſſert, that the untutored and undiſciplined mind of man, is in *general*, not only averſe to that which is good, but prone, in reality, to practices ſo abſolutely bad, as to be a diſgrace to the honour and dignity of intelligent and rational beings.

(*a*) The patriarchs, ſays Euſebius, were adorned with a life that is according to nature, (to original nature) by right reaſonings they were adorned with the virtue of religion; by natural reaſonings and written laws, ſteering the right courſe of virtue, they paſſed beyond fleſhy pleaſures into an every-way wiſe and religious life. Beſides which, he ſays, that they had extraordinary appearances of God, and converſe with him; were Φιλοι Θεουκ Προφηται, "the friends of God and prophets." Euſeb. Prep. Evan. lib. vii. cap. 5, 7. They are therefore, as ſays Brockleſby, not to be looked upon merely as holy men, but as ſome extraordinary miniſters of religion. Brock. 731.

they never prevail at all, but where there is a correſpondent aptitude of mind for receiving the deſtructive impreſſion *; and then ſecondly, the enquiry here is not by what means we may cure, check the progreſs, or avoid the infection of thoſe diſorders and diſeaſes of the ſoul, which ſink it ſo far below the rank and dignity of intellectual and rational beings, but how to trace them to their fountain-head. It cannot be ſuppoſed, that the Deity himſelf infuſed them; nor can we, with any degree of propriety, aſcribe them, as will be ſhewn hereafter to any obliquity of nature derived from *Adam*,—derived, I mean, from the nature of that body which we do in reality inherit from him †.

That

---

* When we ſay men are miſled by external circumſtances of temptation, it cannot but be underſtood that there is ſomewhat within themſelves, to render thoſe circumſtances temptations, or to render them ſuſceptible of impreſſions from them; ſo when we ſay, they are miſled by paſſions, it is always ſuppoſed, that there are occaſions, circumſtances, and objects exciting thoſe paſſions, and affording means for gratifying them. Vid. Butler's Anal. p. 107.

† And yet ſuch has been, and is ſtill the prevailing opinion among men, owing to their not forming to themſelves clear conceptions of that *duplex* compoſition of which ſcripture and experience prove us to conſiſt, *viz.* the *carnal* man and *ſpiritual*. Some indeed have been wiſe enough to aſcribe to man a *triple* ſoul, the vegetative, animal, and rational *(a)*; imagining, that among ſo many different ſpecies of ſouls, it was a chance but that there might be one, upon which they could, with propriety, fix the riſe and propagation of bad paſſions. In anſwer to this, it may, with great confidence, I think, be affirmed, that the belief of a double or triple ſoul in man is abſurd to the laſt degree; that only *one* and the

(a) Alluſive to which abſurdity, ſays Ben Johnſon in his Poetaſter: "What, ſhall I turn ſhark upon my friends, or my "friends' friends? I ſcorn it with my three ſouls."
Vid. Warburton, in Shakeſpear's Twelfth Night, p. 144.

That the firſt cannot be the caſe, even this ſingle conſideration evinces, *viz.* that we are not univer-

---

the *ſame* ſoul actuates and animates that duplex, that ſpiritual and animal nature, of which we now conſiſt; and that from its acting under two ſeparate and diſtinct relations, there ariſes the exertion of two ſorts of propenſions or deſires, in their natures eſſentially different: theſe *Malebranche* chuſes to diſtinguiſh by the terms *paſſions* and *natural inclinations*; I would rather call them our *paſſions* and our *natural affections*. The former are the reſult and conſequence of the ſoul's relation to, and union with the body: the latter the eſſential workings of its own free and independent ſelf. The one are the cravings, as it were, of the ſoul, to which the nature and conſtitution of the body make her ſubject, which are neceſſary for her ſupport and nouriſhment, and which we have in common with brutes *(a)*, *viz.* hunger, thirſt, concupiſcence, ſelf-affection, *&c.* and theſe we may term her *paſſions* in contradiſtinction to thoſe intellectual and independent motions, which are eſſential to, or however ariſe from her ſpiri-

(a) Agreeably to which the generality of philoſophers, ſays the learned Mr. Brockleſby, diſtinguiſh two parts in the ſoul of man, the inferior and ſuperior. The one is common to the brutes, and falleth within the comprehenſion of ſenſitive nature, which they call παθητικον (the ſeat of the bodily appetites, affections, and paſſions) the other is τὸ λογικον, the rational nature; and between theſe two, as contrary operative principles, there is uſually a conflict and combat. Διτὴη γαρ ἐϛι μαχομενη φυσις εις ἐν κικραμενη, for two natures, conflicting one with the other, are conjuncted, the ſenſitive (the appetites to ſenſitive good) reſiſting, and withſtanding the rational nature, diſcerning and dictating the good of honeſty. In this conflict the ſenſitive nature uſually prevails by its deceit and impetuous violence, not only againſt mens reſolutions to the contrary in their ſober mood, but againſt the preſent light and dictates of their minds, ἐκ βιας ὑπὸ θυμιων αἱ προσελθουσαι, ἀγουσι, κ᾽ ἑλκουσι, by the force of their deſires, which carry and drag them.

The mind is tyrannically lorded over by brutal affections, which are uſually in motion and commotion, the irrational paſſions poſſeſſing it, and diſtracting it, and in ſome ſort compelling it to do the things that are deſirable to them. For every paſſion has a compulſory force in it; it dethrones or expels reaſonings. See Brockleſby's Goſpel-Theiſm, p. 708.

univerſally affected by that body in a ſimilar manner. Men differ from each other as much in their affection as in their faces. And if to this it be replied that that may be owing to ſome different texture and modification of one and the ſame ſpecies of matter, I would aſk, how it comes to paſs that ſuch a great contrariety of tempers ſhould be ſo frequently met with in perſons of the very

---

ſpiritual frame, and which may therefore be moſt properly ſtiled the ſoul's affections. The firſt are what the apoſtle means by that *Law in his members warring againſt the law of his mind, and bringing him into captivity to the law of ſin*,—that *carnal mind*, which is *enmity againſt God*,—whence proceed what he ſtiles the *laſts of the fleſh, viz* adultery, fornication, *&c.* the latter are what the ſame apoſtle terms the *fruits of the ſpirit, viz.* love, joy, peace, gentleneſs, meekneſs, *&c.* When we are enquiring therefore into the riſe and progreſs of the various vices and frailties of mankind, we ſhould carefully diſtinguiſh between ſuch propenſions as are in reality their *fault*, and thoſe which are only their *misfortune*. The ſoul's paſſions, thoſe to which ſhe is made ſubject by her alliance with the body, are neceſſary for the ſupport and continuance of that union and connection, and are conſequently only ſinful when gratified beyond the bounds and reſtrictions which reaſon, religion, and the laws of ſociety preſcribe. Theſe we derive neceſſarily from the nature and conſtitution of that body we inherit from *Adam*. And theſe are, properly ſpeaking, not the ſoul's faults, but her misfortunes; as being of a carnal, ſenſual nature only; nor are theſe the affections of the mind to which I allude, and from which is proveable the depravity of nature; which conſiſts, and only conſiſts of irregularities, inconſiſtences, and actual blemiſhes in her *intellectual* frame; ſuch as are envy, malice, revenge, cruelty, *&c.* And when the apoſtle ranks even theſe in his catalogue of the *works of the fleſh*, we are not to conſider him as pronouncing them the genuine, neceſſary effects and productions of the fleſh, but as principles which are moſt uſually diſcernable in and leſs reſtrained by thoſe, whoſe deſires terminate more on the gratification of ſenſual appetites and paſſions, than in correcting and reforming the degeneracy of their ſpiritual and more natural affections.

very ſame kind of complexion, and ſeemingly ſimilar texture of body *?

The external form and figure indeed is that by which your phyſiognomiſts aim to read the internal man †, yet experience ſhews, that that is not an index which invariably and infallibly points true.

§ 10. Nor is there the leaſt reaſon in nature to expect that it ſhould. It is not poſſible that purely paſſive *matter* ſhould impart principles not its own, or, in other words, the active properties and eſſentials of *ſpirit*. So that it is of courſe not poſſible, that the ſoul can receive either her *good* or *bad intellectual qualities* from this or that frame or temperature of the body. We may as well ſuppoſe the very conſtruction of the ſoul to be material, as make it dependent on matter for its properties.

§ 11. The ſoul's native powers indeed are ſo far dependent on the nature and quality of that heterogeneous vehicle wherein it is contained, and from which it is furniſhed with all its proper inſtruments of ſenſe and reflection, as to be enabled to operate to only that confined degree of excellence and perfection, to which the properties of that vehicle are ſuited. Hence ariſes moſt probably that ſubordination of intellectual abilities obſervable in the ſeveral ſpecies of intelligent natures. Hence it is that brute creatures are become inferior to us in the uſe of their reaſoning

---

* The reader is to take notice, that I am now ſpeaking of the real affections of the mind, not the ſenſual paſſions, which ariſe from the ſoul's connection with the body.

† Διγος απ οφθαλμε κ᾽ το νοημα μαθειν.

Theoc.

And the wiſe ſon of Sirach ſays, " A man may be known " by his looks." Eccluſ. xix. 29.

faculties, as we are perhaps to angels. Brutes can reaſon and reflect only in part; and how inconſiderable and contracted is the utmoſt range of *human* reaſoning, when compared with the intellectual powers of the *angelic* hoſt! Had the ſouls of brutes been lodged in a vehicle like our own, it is probable that they might have attained to as high a degree of rationality in this their ſublunary ſphere of action, as we have done; and that we ſhould ourſelves have experienced a debility of reaſoning ſimilar to that to which they are reduced, had we been thrown into a body entirely organized, as is theirs*.

§ 12. As

Siquidem res eadem nobis et illis eſt, ſays St. Cyprian. [Advers, Gent. l. ii. p. 257.] una per quam eſſe animantia dicimur, et Motum agitare vitalem. And again, p. 94. Nonne primordiis iiſdem eadem et me et Beſtias genuit imformavitque natura. Nonne ſpiritus unus eſt qui et illos et me regit. Non conſimilimi ratione reſpiro et video et cæteris afficior ſenſibus?

* Moſt of the ancient philoſophers taught, that the ſouls of beaſts were rational; from whence it follows, that they believed thoſe ſouls to differ in *degrees* of rationality only from thoſe of men. Anaxagoras placed that difference in this particular, viz. "That men are capable of explaining their reaſonings, whereas beaſts are not able to explain theirs." Vid. Plutarch. de Placit Philoſ. lib. v. cap. 20. p. 908.

Pythagoras and Plato had the ſame thoughts on this point. They ſaid, that the ſouls of beaſts, though truly rational, act not according to reaſon, becauſe they want the uſe of ſpeech, and their organs are not well proportioned,—That the mere diſpoſition of the organs hindered reaſon from appearing in beaſts, as it appears in men. See Bayle's life of Pereira.

Agreeably to which, ſays Virgil,

Igneus eſt ollis vigor et cœleſtis origo
Seminibus: quantum non noxia corpora tardant,
Terrenique hebetant artus, moribundaque membra.

And that the ſouls of men and beaſts are, in their nature, intrinſically

§ 12. As the inherent depravity of the ſoul, therefore evidently proceeds not from the conſtitu-

 tional

intrinſically the ſame, and that there is not that great diſparity between the ſouls of men and beaſts as is uſually ſuppoſed, we ſeem authoriſed to conclude, from what the ſacred preacher ſays upon the point.

" I ſaid in mine heart, concerning the eſtate of the ſons of " men, that God might manifeſt, or (as agreeably to the ori- " ginal it ſhould be tendered) God will make manifeſt, that " they are beaſts. For that which befalleth the ſons of men " befalleth beaſts, even one thing befalleth them: as one " dieth, ſo dieth the other, yea they have all one breath, ſo " that a man hath no pre-eminence over a beaſt. All go " unto one place, all are of duſt, and all turn to duſt again.' Eccleſ. iii. 19, 20.

Diogenes ſaid, that beaſts are made up of a body and a ſoul, and that if their ſoul does not actually feel and reaſon, it is becauſe the thickneſs of its organs, and the great quantity of humours, reduce it to the condition of mad-men. See Plut. de Plac. Philoſoph.

Appoſite to this reflection is the following extract from the ingenious author of Reflections on the Œconomy of Nature in Animal Life.

It is certain, ſays he, that the ſelf-motive and ſelf-active principle, or ſpiritual ſubſtance, that actuates or animates organiſed matter, muſt have, eſſentially and actually, inherent in it all thoſe natural qualities, faculties, and endowments, in the higheſt perfection, that it ever exerts or attains to in any time of its duration. To augment or encreaſe in eſſential qualities is an abſurdity, and to augment or encreaſe naturally is only the property of body and matter; but ſpiritual ſubſtance being indiviſible and immortal, if it could admit of more or leſs, in natural or eſſential qualities, it might ceaſe to be; I mean as to its natural qualities of living, perceiving, and willing, *i. e.* of cogitation or thinking; for as to its moral qualities of juſtice, goodneſs, and truth, they may encreaſe or decreaſe to any degree, ſince they entirely depend on the free will; and therefore the natural faculties of living, perceiving, and willing; and thus ſeveral degrees and modifications of activity, ſagacity, and deſire, are eſſentially and uniformly permanent in it in their order and degree, whatever kind of body it animates;

tional qualities of that body it is made to inhabit here, ſo neither is it,

Secondly, to be conſidered as impreſſed on it by him that formed it.

§ 13. It is impoſſible that the Deity can be the parent of imperfection. By which I do not mean to aſſert, that God cannot produce any thing ſhort of, or inferior to perfection itſelf. For then *finite* beings could not be the offspring of an *infinite* one, nor an effect be unequal to the cauſe from whence it proceeded. But this I do venture to aſſert, that nothing imperfect in *its kind* can come out as ſuch immediately from the hands of God. And yet however true and unqueſtionable ſuch a poſition is, the reverſe would evidently be the caſe, if man in his ſtate of *nature*, is as he came *firſt* from the hands of God; for then every intellectual deformity and irregularity is a blemiſh in the creature, chargeable wholly and ſolely upon God its creator. Then the envious, the malicious, the cruel and revengeful, are not more excentric from the laws of virtue and purity, or, in other words, not worſe than they ſhould or could be; and the

---

mates; and when it does not exert theſe innate and eſſential qualities, it is becauſe it is limited and reſtrained by the nature of groſs matter, and the laws of the body which it animates, which is a foreign impediment, inſuperable to its degree of ſelf-activity and ſelf-mobility. For an angel is as truly an angel, as to its ſpiritual nature and faculties, informing the body of a ſerpent, or any other organized body, as informing the body of a man. And an angel, animating any human body, would be only a more perfect man, and, by its natural and eſſential qualities could then only more perfectly exert human functions and operations. An unorganized body could produce no vital functions; it could only put it into particular motions. Vid. Cheyne, Nat. Method of curing diſeaſes of the body and mind, p. 1, 2, 3.

thing

thing formed may ſay unto him that formed it, Why haſt thou made me thus?

§ 14. Moſt writers on the ſubject of the human paſſions aſſert indeed, what may be judged perhaps a ſufficient anſwer to the above remark, that moſt, if not all of thoſe paſſions, which men uſually deem bad, are, in various inſtances, *conſequentially* good, and of courſe not to be looked upon as blemiſhes and imperfections in our nature—That *ambition*, for example, is productive of deeds that ſerve, in many reſpects, to agrandize the prince and his people; introduces into a public ſphere of action, men beſt qualified to advance the honour, reputation, and intereſts of their king and country, and tranſmit to poſterity many illuſtrious examples of magnanimity and undaunted bravery—That the paſſion of *pride* ſwells the mind to a reſiſtance of mean, ſelfiſh, abject conſiderations, or any diſhonourable or unjuſt attacks upon a man's probity. That even *envy* has apparently its advantages, inaſmuch as it ſpurs a man on to a rivalſhip of another in his virtues and noble exploits—That *covetouſneſs* ſerves to create an abundance, which the heir, actuated by a different kind of ſpirit from the firſt poſſeſſor, is enabled to diffuſe in various acts of generoſity, and a well-placed beneficence. This is the light in which, as far as I can recollect, writers on this ſubject, place, for the moſt part, theſe and other paſſions of the human breaſt, in order to ſhew that they are not what I eſteem them to be, real blemiſhes. But if reaſon may be allowed to be a proper judge in this caſe, I would aſk whether this is not abſolutely confounding the eſſential difference between good and evil, judging of the *nature* of our paſſions from their *accidental effects* and *conſequences*, and blending the *eſſence* of things with their

their *ends* and *uſes?* For ſuppoſing, though not granting, the accidental *effects* iſſuing from thoſe above-mentioned paſſions, to be a proper criterion whereby to aſcertain their expediency and real value, we ſhall even then, I think, find ſufficient reaſon to pronounce them, in general, *bad.* They are as frequently *miſchievous* in their effects, as *beneficial*, and perhaps more ſo. It was *ambition*, you'll ſay, that makes *Alexander* ſhine with ſuch diſtinguiſhed luſtre in the annals of fame, and I'll grant it; but did it not give to the world at the ſame time, and in the ſame perſon, a madman, and a murderer of millions? It was to the monarch's *pride* that *Babylon* owed her magnificent temples, and her other ſumptuous buildings that were the glory and wonder of the age in which he lived; but did not that ſame intoxicating paſſion ſink at laſt the renowned lord thereof into the ſimilitude of a creature inferior to the loweſt of the human ſpecies?

With reſpect to *envy*——

——————Say firſt what cauſe
Mov'd our grand parents in that happy ſtate,
Favour'd of Heaven ſo highly, to fall off
From their Creator, and tranſgreſs his will
For one reſtraint—lords of the world beſides?
Who firſt ſeduc'd them to that foul revolt?
The infernal Serpent, he it was, whoſe guile,
Stirr'd up with *envy* and revenge deceiv'd
The mother of mankind———.

As for *covetouſneſs*, if that be either in principle, or in practice, a virtue, then in the catalogue of vices charity muſt of courſe be inſerted as *one.*

§ 15. In ſhort, it will not be denied, but that, in the general courſe of God's providence, *good* will frequently ariſe out of *evil.* But then it ought to

to be conſidered, that the good accidentally iſſuing therefrom, does not alter its ſpecific nature and quality. And as there are paſſions which, without any kind of diſpute, are intrinſically *good*, the reverſe of thoſe paſſions muſt of courſe be intrinſically *bad*, be they in their conſequences *accidentally* this or that; elſe adieu to all diſtinctions between *good* and *evil*, between virtue and vice, between the righteous and the wicked! As therefore among the various affections incident to the human kind, there are ſome which muſt undoubtedly be denominated *bad*, thoſe are a blemiſh in the *creature* chargeable on the *Creator*, if the former had not an *exiſtence prior* to its appearance here.

§ 16. It is urged indeed by a very lively and ſprightly writer, " That in the ſcale of beings " there muſt be ſomewhere ſuch a creature as " man, with all his infirmities about him,—that a " removal of theſe would be altering his very na- " ture, and that as ſoon as he became perfect, " he *muſt ceaſe to be man**."

The removal of man's infirmities would be altering undoubtedly the very nature of man; but is the inference from thence juſt, that man comes into the world with all his imperfections about him, " *becauſe* there muſt be ſomewhere in the " ſcale of Beings a creature ſo unfortunately and immorally formed?"

To ſuppoſe God neceſſitated to call into his aid *evil*, for the better carrying on his moral government of the world, is methinks an idea of providence, not ſhort—may I not ſay of mental blaſphemy? If the ingenious author had ſaid that moral evil will in the final *iſſue* of things be pro-

* See Nat. and Origin. of Evil, p. 98.

ductive

ductive of a far ſuperior degree of moral good, it would have been judged by the generality of his readers I imagine a much better apology for the introduction of moral *evil* into the world, than what he has deviſed.

Having now ſhewn, that the depravity of the human mind is not occaſioned either by the groſs ſtate and condition of that body in which the ſoul is now lodged, nor impreſſed on it by him that formed it, it would be an affront to common ſenſe, and to the reader's judgment, to imagine he would not grant me this concluſion, that it can be none elſe than the effect of a lapſe of ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate; eſpecially if to what has been already obſerved, he adds an impartial attention to the enſuing chapters. And as the article of the church of England concerning original ſin has been generally underſtood to aſſert that the depravity of human nature is a corruption of the heart derived entirely from Adam's tranſgreſſion; the reader will not I hope think it too digreſſive from the point in view to take that article under conſideration, and to ſee whether it can with any degree of propriety be interpreted into ſuch a meaning.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The article of the church of England concerning original ſin and the depravity of human nature conſidered and explained.

§ 1. "ORIGINAL ſin," ſays the ninth article of the church of *England*, "ſtandeth not in the following of *Adam*, (as the "*Pelagians* do vainly boaſt) but it is the *nature* of "every man that is naturally engendered of the "offſpring of *Adam*, whereby man is very far "gone from original righteouſneſs, and is of his "own nature inclined to evil, ſo that the fleſh "luſteth always contrary to the ſpirit, and there-"fore in every perſon born into the world it de-"ſerves God's wrath, and damnation."

§ 2. From the firſt clauſe of which article there are two propoſitions plainly deducible; the former of which is *affirmative*, and the other *negative*.

Firſt, it is therein poſitively implied (though not indeed actually, and in expreſs terms declared) that there is a particular kind of ſin chargeable upon mankind, which is peculiarly, and moſt properly termed *original*; but that,

Secondly, and negatively, the ſin ſo called is not what the *Pelagians* pronounced it to be.

§ 3. Now, though it cannot be denied, that the term *original*, as applied to *ſin*, is no where to be met with in holy writ, yet ſufficient authority ariſes from thence, for imputing to the whole race of mankind, what may aptly enough be termed the guilt of *original ſin*. This was the opinion of the church in the fifth century,

though as to its ideas of the nature of it, and the circumſtances wherein it conſiſted, the church and *Pelagians* widely differed, without being either of them, as it happened, in the right.

§ 4. The former reſolved it all into *Adam*'s fatal offence, the latter into ſuch kind of treſpaſſes as were peculiarly mens own. The one ſuppoſed that the ſin of *Adam* was of ſuch an univerſal and diffuſive efficacy, as to derive a guilt and ſtain to mankind in all ages of the world, and this on account of the relation which all men have to *Adam*, as their natural and moral principal, or head, from whom they *therefore* derive a general depravity of nature, and a mind prone to ſin and wickedneſs; the other urged, that *Adam*'s tranſgreſſion was a crime of a perſonal nature only, and not derivative of any of the leaſt guilt to his deſcendants; that it was not productive of any of thoſe bad propenſions obſervable ſince in mankind, but that both he and they were *originally* created perfectly pure and innocent, though fallible and peccable at the ſame time; and that conſequently ſin took its origin from, and could only be imputable to every man's own perſonal acts and treſpaſſes *. Though of theſe two opinions on this point, the latter makes by much the neareſt approach to truth, the former admitting of no kind of defence from either reaſon or ſcripture, as will hereafter be fully ſhewn, yet it does not ſufficiently coincide with holy writ, which, whilſt it gives plain intimations of another kind of guilt imputable to mankind,

---

* Hæreſin illius (Pelagii) quod attinet ſumma huc fere redit. Peccatum originale funditus ſuſtulit, docens Adami peccatum ſoboli ejus non imputari, unumquemque e contra in eadem quâ Adam creatus eſt voluntatis perfectione naſci. Vid. Cave. Script. Eccleſ. Hiſt. Liter. Vol. i. p.

than

than what ariſes merely from their own perſonal treſpaſſes here, is repugnant altogether to *Pelagius*'s conjecture, that *Adam* and his poſterity came into this world perfectly pure and innocent.

We are, ſays the apoſtle, by *nature* the children of wrath, *&c.*

§ 5. Amidſt this great oppoſition of opinions between the church and the *Pelagians*, concerning *original ſin*, in which each of them ran wide of the mark, the compilers of our articles, by their openly condemning the one, and tacitly rejecting the other, ſeem to *me* to have had an eye to a *ſtate pre-exiſtent*, as the only hypotheſis by means of which could fairly be removed every difficulty lying in the way of both. If that be not the caſe, it will be difficult, if not abſolutely impoſſible, to explain that article in any rational or conſiſtent ſenſe at all.

§ 6. "Original ſin, ſays the article, ſtandeth "not in the following of *Adam* (as the *Pelagians* "do vainly talk)" *i. e.* It ſtandeth not in ſinning, like him, perſonally *here*, and againſt an expreſs law of God. Well, but how then doth it ſtand? Standeth it in any crime relative or imputative? No. Standeth it in any guilt or ſtain in mankind, derived to them from *Adam*'s tranſgreſſion, on account of the relation which all men bear to him, as their natural principal or head? No ſuch thing. But it is—What? "Why it is the fault, or cor-"ruption of the nature of every man, that natu-"rally is engendered of the offſpring of *Adam*, "whereby man is far gone from original righ-"teouſneſs, and is of his own *nature* inclined to "evil."

§ 7 Now it will not conſiſt with the reaſon and nature of things, or with our uſual ideas of the amiable and all-perfect attributes of God, to ima-

gine that the fault or corruption of the nature of every man is *therefore* ſinful, ſo as to deſerve *God's wrath and damnation*, *becauſe* he is of the offſpring of *Adam*. Nor ſhould we haſtily aſcribe to the compilers of our articles an opinion ſo horid.

When they therefore ſay, that original ſin is a fault, or corruption of the nature of every man, that is naturally engendered of the offſpring of *Adam*, they can, I apprehend, mean nothing more or leſs than this, *viz.* That it is a fault or corruption interwoven in the *nature* of every offſpring of *Adam*, whereby, or on account of which fault or corruption, man is far gone from original righteouſneſs (that righteouſneſs in which he was originally created) and is therefore of his *own* nature, not any kind of nature derived to him from *Adam*, of his *own* nature inclined to evil.

§ 8. Let us ſee then what, upon a further examination of this article, as above ſtated and explained, may be fairly deduced therefrom, relative to the doctrine of original ſin.

Firſt then, it tells us what it is not, and

Secondly, it informs us what in reality it is.

It is not what the *Pelagians* eſteemed it to be, whoſe opinion on that head we have before conſidered, and ſhall not need now to repeat—But it is—What? Why it is the guilt of a particular kind of ſin emphatically termed *original*, the nature of which we find expreſly repreſented to us under the idea of a fault or corruption of the nature of every man naturally engendered of the offſpring of *Adam*, *&c.* But how the fault or corruption of every offſpring of *Adam?* Are we by that to underſtand, that *Adam*'s ſin is tranſmitted to us by traduction? That cannot, with any ſhadow of reaſon, be ſuppoſed. Nothing but a man's own

perſonal

perſonal diſobedience can make him a ſinner in the ſight of *man*, or of *God*. He only that *ſins* can be a ſinner*. No one can ſin by proxy, can ſin by virtue of any act of another perſon, to which he himſelf was not privy, or in any ſhape concerned. And it needs no proof ſurely that we could be neither mediately, nor immediately, agents in the ſinful act of *Adam*, which was commited at a diſtance of more than 5000 years before we are ſuppoſed to have had a vital exiſtence.

§ 9. If however, it be urged, that the article cannot mean, that we are *conſidered* as actual ſinners, but only that we are *treated as* ſuch in conſequence of *Adam*'s tranſgreſſion; that not his *ſin*, but that *body* of ſin, which he contracted by ſin, is tranſmitted to us by traduction, on account of

---

* "A repreſentative of a moral action, ſays doctor Taylor, is what I can by no means digeſt. A repreſentative, the guilt of whoſe conduct ſhall be imputed to us, and whoſe ſins ſhall corrupt and debauch our nature, is one of the greateſt abſurdities in all the ſyſtem of corrupt religion.—That any man, without my knowledge or conſent, ſhould ſo repreſent me, that when he is guilty, I am to be reputed guilty; and when he tranſgreſſes, I ſhall be accountable and puniſhable for his tranſgreſſion, and thereby ſubjected to the wrath and curſe of God; nay further, that his wickedneſs ſhall give me a ſinful nature, and all this before I am born, and conſequently while I am in no capacity of knowing, helping, or hindering what he doth; ſurely any one, ſays that ingenious writer, who dares uſe his underſtanding, muſt clearly ſee this is unreaſonable, and altogether inconſiſtent with the truth and goodneſs of God." See Dr. Taylor's ſupplement to Scrip. Doct. of orig. ſin, p. 109.

"Nor does the apoſtle in Rom. v. 12——20, as the ſame writer had before obſerved, mention, or intimate, the conveyance of a ſinful nature, or any conſequence of Adam's offence, in which all mankind are concerned, beſides that death which all men die, when they leave this world." Vid. ibid. p. 107.

And as ſays St. Chryſoſtom, we are puniſhed or ſaved by our own works. Απο των οικειων εργων κολαζομεθα και σωζομεθα

which

which we are made naturally ſubject to ſin, and of conſequence equally expoſed with him to the guilt and puniſhment of it; what is this but a reflection on the juſtice and wiſdom of God, as unworthy as the former?——Suppoſing us not accountable, I mean, for any *prior* ſin——there being no difference, that I can perceive, between making ſin itſelf neceſſary, hereditary, or eſſential to the ſoul, and the cloathing it with a body, that neceſſarily prompts, diſpoſes, or gives fuel to evil actions.

§ 10. When our article therefore ſays, that original ſin is the fault or corruption of the *nature* of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of *Adam*, it can only in *reaſon* mean, that ſin is *born* with every ſuch offspring of *Adam*, and brought into the world with him from the very womb, not by any derived, imputed guilt of another*, but from ſome actual and inherent depravity in his own nature; for the article in expreſs terms declares, that on account of this fault or corruption of the nature of man he is far gone from original righteouſneſs.

§ 11. If it be ſaid, that by original righteouſneſs we are to underſtand that ſtate of righteouſneſs only in which *Adam* was created, and from which man is far gone, *i. e.* widely differs from—*quam longiſſimè diſtat*—by means of a vitioſity of nature with which he comes into the world; I

* It is not poſſible, ſays Mr. Brockleſby, that Adam, by his tranſgreſſion, ſhould merit for the ſouls of all his offspring their ſtate of blindneſs, pravity, ſpiritual death, to be deprived of the holy ſpirit and the divine image, with all the honours and felicities thereof, and to be ſubjected to eternal puniſhment in the world to come; for it never was, nor can be in any man's power to kill ſouls, ſays he, without their own conſent. Brockleſby, p. 468.

would

would aſk, how we can make it reconcileable with reaſon to ſuppoſe, that God ſhould, in the exerciſe of his creative power and authority, indicate ſo cruel a partiality towards the *deſcendants* of Adam, as to force them into exiſtence with a leſs ſhare of infuſed righteouſneſs in *their* nature, than was vouchſafed to their *primogenitor?* Or that becauſe the one forfeited at length that integrity and uprightneſs of ſoul with which *he* was at firſt formed, his *offspring* ſhould be neceſſarily created in ſin? ſhould, at their ſuppoſed firſt entrance into life, be made ſlaves to impetuous paſſions and affections, which the former, being created in the image of God, (*Gen.* i. 27.) could, of courſe, only have contracted by a ſubſequent abuſe of his reaſon and underſtanding? This is a view of the divine Being and his providence, comprehenſive, may I not ſay, of abſolute blaſphemy?

§ 12. I cannot therefore ſee what elſe can be meant by the *original righteouſneſs* mentioned in the article under conſideration, than a ſuppoſed actual ſtate of righteouſneſs, in which the intellectual inhabitants of this world were originally created, and from which they had ſwerved in a prior ſtate. Whether that be the caſe or not, it muſt be left to the reader's judgment to determine. This however, is clearly the ſenſe of the article, as to the *nature* of original ſin, or that wherein it conſiſts, *viz.* that it is the *fault* or *corruption* of the *nature* of every man that is *naturally* engendered of *Adam.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Scripture account of the Fallen Angels illuſtrated and confirmed.

§ 1. THAT *human* ſouls are of coeval origin with *angelic*, and both the production of one inſtantaneous exertion of infinite power, it ſeems neceſſary to conclude, becauſe in the firſt place, no reaſon can be aſſigned why the Deity ſhould give the preference implied in a priority of creation to this, or that order of intelligent natures, rather than to another: And ſecondly, becauſe a *ſucceſſive traduction* of ſouls, or a *daily creation* of them (one or other of which muſt elſe be ſuppoſed) is the one an actual impoſſibility in nature, and the other a ſuppoſition, which conveys an idea of the Creator, than which there cannot be one more groſs and unworthy *.

§ 2. And

* A ſucceſſive traduction of ſouls is, as Dr. Henry More obſerves, "A plain contradiction to the notion of a ſoul, "which is a ſpirit, and therefore of an indiviſible, that is, of "an indiſcerpible eſſence. And a daily creation of them im- "plies both an indignity to the majeſty of God (in making "him the chiefeſt aſſiſtant and actor in the higheſt, freeſt, "and moſt particular way in which the Divinity can be con- "ceived to act, in thoſe abominable crimes of whoredom, "adultery, and inceſt, by ſupplying thoſe foul coitions with "new-created ſouls for the purpoſe) and alſo an injury to "the ſouls themſelves; that they being ever thus created by "the immediate hand of God, and therefore pure, innocent, "and immaculate, ſhould be impriſoned in unclean, diſeaſ- "ed, and diſordered bodies, where very many of them ſeem "to be ſo fatally over-maſtered, and in ſuch an utter inca- "pacity of cloſing with what is good and virtuous, that they "muſt

§ 2. And that the *Moſaic* was not the *original creation of all things*, but that prior to it, there exiſted an univerſe of rational beings, all but men of the moſt contracted ſentiments will readily enough conceive †.

§ 3. And

" muſt needs be adjudged to that extreme calamity, which " attends all thoſe that forget God." See Dr. More's Immortality of the Soul, p. 113.

See alſo Glanville's Lux Orientalis; where the above arguments are expatiated upon in a moſt comprehenſive and maſterly manner.

† It is the opinion of the generality of writers, who look no further than to the letter of the Moſaic hiſtory, that the whole frame of nature comes within the compaſs of the ſix days creation: that not only the ſun, moon, and planets, but the immenſe ſyſtem of the fixed ſtars, are there deſcribed as coeval with the formation of our earth: conſequently they muſt hold, that till about ſix thouſand years ago, the Deity exiſted alone, reigning over an abſolute void without either worlds or inhabitants. But as the contrary opinion may be fairly deduced from many paſſages in Scripture, ſo it is much more agreeable to our juſteſt apprehenſions of the Divine nature to ſuppoſe, that the fountain of power and goodneſs had created worlds, and communicated being to many orders of creatures long before our earth or its inhabitants had an exiſtence. See Jameſon, Pref. to his Expoſit. of the Pentat. Again; By the heaven, ſays Mr. Jackſon on Gen. i. 1.— " In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"— we are to underſtand the ſeveral ſyſtems of the ſun, moon, and planets, which were created before the formation of the earth, of which only Moſes gives a particular account, and to which his hiſtory primarily belongs. It is ſaid, " God made two " great lights," viz. the ſun and the moon; and it is certain that the earth was, by God's almighty power, ſo ſituated, with reſpect to the poſition of the ſun and moon, that they might have their proper influence over it, and ſo with propriety be ſaid to have been new made to rule over its day and night. They now became properly a ſun and moon to the earth, whether they were then created, when they firſt ſhone upon it, or before.

§ 3. And as every part of the creation muſt, when iſſuing firſt from the hands of the Creator, be *perfect* in its *kind* (the fountain being pure, the ſtreams flowing therefrom muſt be pure alſo.) It neceſſarily follows, that the univerſe of rational creatures came into being poſſeſſed of as large a ſhare of intellectual purity, and moral rectitude, as *finite* natures can be ſuppoſed capable of enjoying, or an *all-perfect* power able to beſtow. But from the very ſtate, and circumſtances of their exiſtence, and that *freedom of will*, which conſtituted them *moral agents*, it is eaſy, and even neceſſary to conceive, that though *pure*, and *per-*

The Hebrew word עשה Aſa, or Aſe rendered to make, ſignifies alſo to conſtitute, or appoint, or prepare; and ſo it may mean, that God appointed two great lights, the one to rule over the day, the other to rule over the night. And it is evident, that the word may be taken in the preterpluperfect tenſe, as it is in the 31ſt verſe, where it is rightly rendered, "and God ſaw every thing that he had made."——Therefore, though it is undoubtedly true, that God made, or created the ſun, moon, and ſtars, yet there is no need to underſtand that they are any part of the Moſaic creation, which comprehended only the heavens and the earth, or the earth with its firmament or atmoſphere, which is called heaven. See Jackſon's Chronol. Antiq. p. 4, 5.

Agreeably to which, our learned and ingenious Brokleſby had before obſerved, that the original creation was ante-Moſaical; that the Moſaical Coſmopœia was not God's *original* creation, nor the creation of the *vaſt univerſe* of *rationals*, but a *ſecondary* creation, a creation of our *terreſtrial ſyſtem* only; and that our planetary globe, though in reſpect of the matter of it, it was a part of God's original creation, yet as formed and inhabited, did not belong to the original conſtitution of the univerſe. See Brockleſby's Chriſtian Trinitarian, p. 493. &c. The truth of which hypotheſis he ſupports by a variety of cogent arguments, ſome of which may occaſionally come in perhaps hereafter.

feet

fect in their *kind*, they were nevertheleſs *peccable*, and liable to *tranſgreſſion* *. It is an aſſertion of *Calvin*, that the holy angels themſelves are not

 uncriminal,

---

* " Unleſs a man, ſays Dr. Cheyne, gives up all reaſon, " philoſophy, and proportion, as well as analogy, and runs " into downright ſcepticiſm, blind fate, witchcraft and en- " chantment, he muſt ſuppoſe, that an infinitely wiſe and be- " neficent being could not have created free and intelligent " creatures, but for ſome wiſe end and purpoſe. And to ob- " tain this end he muſt have made them at firſt ſound (ſo he " is pleaſed to expreſs himſelf) in body and mind. How er- " ror, diſeaſes, miſery, and death commenced, may readily be " accounted for from the abuſe of freedom and liberty, ſpu- " rious ſelf-love, and an inordinate love of the creature." See Cheyne, Diſcourſe iv. p. 119.

An argument equally concluſive as to angels and men.

There is ſomething extremely rational and ſatisfactory, as to this point, in what follows from Dr. Jenkin.

" It muſt be conſidered, ſays he, that no created being can, " in its own nature, be uncapable of ſin or default: becauſe " it cannot be infinitely perfect; for it is inſeparable from all " creatures to have but finite perfections; and whatever has " bounds ſet to its perfections is in ſome reſpect imperfect; " that is, it wants thoſe perfections which a being of infinite " perfections alone can have. So that imperfection is implied " in the very eſſence of created beings; and what is imperfect " may make default." Jenkin's Reaſon. of Chr. Rel. vol. ii. p. 238.

And again, p. 246, he ſays, " In the beginning God cre- " ated every thing perfect in its kind, and endued the angels " and men with all intellectual and moral perfections ſuitable " to their reſpective natures; but ſo as to leave them capable " of ſinning. For it pleaſed the infinite wiſdom of God to " place them in a ſtate of trial, and to put it to their own " choice whether they would ſtand in that condition of inno- " cence and happineſs in which they were created, or fall into " ſin and miſery. We have little or no account in the Scrip- " tures of the cauſe or temptation which occaſioned the fall " of angels, becauſe it doth not concern us," ſays he, (But it does concern us much more than he imagined) " to be ac- " quainted with it; and therefore it little becomes us to be " inquiſitive about it." (ſcarce any thing concerns us more,

or

uncriminal, and uncondemnable; they are, "non "*ſatis juſti*," not ſufficiently, or compleatly, *juſt* and *righteous*. "The ſtars are not pure in Gods "ſight," ſays Job, c. xxv. v. 5. And *abſolute impeccability* is, perhaps, the prerogative of *God* only.

§ 4. Accordingly Scripture informs us, that an order of celeſtial powers incurred in proceſs of time their Maker's diſpleaſure, by not keeping their *firſt eſtate*, and leaving their *habitations*.

"And the angels, which kept not their *firſt eſtate*," ſays St. Jude, "but left their *own habi-* "*tation*, he hath reſerved in everlaſting chains "under darkneſs unto the judgment of the great "day." Jude 6th.

§ 5. For the more clear underſtanding of which important paſſage in holy writ, I obſerve, as follows, *Firſt*, That each claſs, or diviſion of the angelic hoſt, had, from the beginning, and have ſtill a determinate region in Heaven aſſigned

---

or merits a more diligent and earneſt enquiry.) But to proceed with our author—"Indeed it is very difficult to con- "ceive, how beings of ſuch great knowledge and purity, as "the fallen angels once were of, ſhould fall into ſin: but it "is to be conſidered that nothing is more unaccountable, "than the motives and cauſes of action in free agents: when "any being is at liberty to do as it will, no other reaſon of "his actings beſides his own will need be enquired after.— "But how perfect and excellent ſoever any creature is, unleſs "it be ſo confirmed and eſtabliſhed in a ſtate of purity and "holineſs, as to be ſecured from all poſſibility of ſinning, it "may be ſuppoſed to admire itſelf, and dote upon its own "perfections and excellencies, and by degrees to neglect and "not acknowledge God the author of them, but to ſin and "rebel againſt him. And it is moſt agreeable both to Scrip- "ture and reaſon, that pride was the cauſe of the fall of "angels." Jenk. vol. ii. p. 246, 247.

Whether this be, or be not, juſt reaſoning upon a matter of fact, as to the motives or cauſes from which it happened, it is quite unneceſſary for me to enquire at preſent.

them,

them, as their proper ſphere of glory, and peculiar place of reſidence.—Agreeably to which, ſays our Saviour, "In my father's houſe are many "manſions." John xiv. 2.—I obſerve *Secondly*, That the intellectual world, that part of it, I mean, with which we ſeem to have any connection, or of which we have any intelligence, appears to have been ranked, and diſpoſed by the Creator, from the beginning, into ſeveral diſtinct claſſes, gradually ſubordinate to each other in dignity and power; in proportion, probably, to the different degrees of intellectual capacity, with which the members of each claſs had been endowed at firſt. Without ſuppoſing ſome ſort of orderly gradation like this, the mind cannot frame to itſelf any idea of an exiſting ſociety or a poſſibility of felicity even in heaven*.

I ob-

---

* If it ſhould be urged that a ſubordination of rank and quality in heaven, would argue an unequal diſtribution of power and authority, and a partiality in the ſupreme Lord thereof, interruptive of univerſal harmony and equal happineſs, and inconſiſtent with our idea of celeſtial fruition—I anſwer, that in minds not vitiated by pride and ambition, obedience to thoſe to whom reverence and eſteem is due, is a ſatisfaction of mind equal, at leaſt, to that which ariſes from a ſuperiority of power, &c. in thoſe to whom is alloted the preheminency.

That there was, however, is, and always will be, ſuch a ſubordination of rank and dignity in the celeſtial abodes, we may conclude from thoſe diſtinctions, which we meet with in Scripture, of angels and arch-angels, of cherubim and ſeraphim, of principalities, powers, thrones, and dominions. 1 Theſſ. iv. 16. Jud. ix. Ezek. x. Pſal. xviii. 10. Iſa. vi. 2. Rom. viii. 38. Epheſ. i. 21. iii. 10. vi. 12. Col. i. 16. ii. 10, 15.

Agreeably to which ſays St. Jerom——That there may be due order amongſt rationals, there muſt be τα πρωτα, τα μεσα, τα ισχατα, the prime, the middle, and the laſt.

And again, ſays another writer, "It is in nature as in the "moſt perfect harmony, in an harmony of ſounds, that which is

"of

I obſerve, *Thirdly*, that in the paſſage to which we allude, the original word Αρχη, which our tranſlators have rendered *firſt eſtate*, is that very word which in the plural number is ſo often uſed in the New Teſtament to denote ſome particular order of angels, and which, in all thoſe places, we denominate *principalities*.

Fourthly, I obſerve, that theſe two expreſſions of the "angels not keeping their firſt eſtate," and "their leaving their own habitations," are not deſigned to convey different, and ſeparate ſenſes, but are explanatory only the one of the other, as the very ſtructure of the ſentence evinces,—The paſſage, therefore, ſhould be rendered thus:

"The angels, which kept not their own prin-
"cipality, [την ιδιαν Αρχην] but left their own habi-
"tation [το ιδιον Οικητηριον] he hath reſerved in ever-
"laſting chains." &c.—That therefore *laſtly*, the crime by which the angels fell in general was: That they kept not themſelves within the bounds of their own proper ſphere of dignity, and glory, but preſumptuouſly deſerted that ſubordinate rank and ſituation, which God had allotted them in the realms above.

§ 6. Hence it was, that that harmony, and tranquility in heaven, which reigned unmoleſted before, underwent for a time, a reverſed fate. He whom ſcripture ſtiles the *prince* of *devils*, one moſt probably of the *higheſt order* of ſpirits, moving in a ſphere perhaps but a few degrees removed (to ſpeak in the language of men) from the throne of God, and diſdaining even the *firſt* degree of *inferiority*. He, I ſay, ſet up his ſtandard againſt the

---

"of a middle nature maketh the conſonancy of the extremes;
"and in all apt compoſures ſomething of a middle nature is
"requiſite." M. Try. Diſſ. 27.

Moſt

Moſt High, inliſted under his banner a multitude of mutinous, and aſpiring ingrates, aiming by their aſſiſtance to rule independent of the will, and authority of the omnipotent, and even to give law to the very Being that gave him life.

——— ——— ——— " aſpiring
" To ſet himſelf in glory above his peers,
" He truſted to have equall'd the Moſt High,
" If he oppoſed, and with ambitious aim
" Againſt the throne, and monarchy of God
" Rais'd impious war in heav'n, and battle proud,
" With vain attempt."

For now the traiterous chieftain, and his infatuated adherents, drew upon themſelves the vengeance of heaven, were baniſhed their celeſtial habitations, and reſerved in everlaſting chains, under darkneſs unto the judgment of the great day*.

§ 7. Agreeable to this is the viſion of St. " John: There was war in heaven; *Michael* and " his angels fought againſt the *dragon*, and the

* By the words " everlaſting chains under darkneſs," we are to underſtand a ſtate of confinement in or about this earth, which, when oppoſed to the inexpreſſible glory and brightneſs of the divine preſence, may aptly enough be expreſſed by " chains of darkneſs."—See Dr. *Hunt*'s diſſertation on the fall.

And the conjecture is not a little countenanced by certain paſſages in ſcripture, where the chief of the devils is called the prince of the power of the *air*, and the devils in general, " Wicked ſpirits in high places"—Epheſ. ii. 2. and vi. 12. And both *Homer* and *Heſiod*, uſe αηρ for ζοφος caligo, darkneſs.

———Ηερι δ', εγχος εκεκλιτο, και ταχε ιππω.
Homer's Iliad. v. 356.

Ηερα εσσαμενοι, παντη φοιτωντες επ αιαν.
Heſiod, Εργ. και Ημερ, I. 124.

" *dra-*

" *dragon* fought and his angels, and prevailed not, " neither was their place found any more in hea- " ven. And the great *dragon* was caſt out, that *old* " *ſerpent*, called the *devil*, and *ſatan*, which deceiv- " eth the whole world : he was caſt out into the " earth, and his angels were caſt out with him." Apocal. xii. 7, 8, 9.

And I make no doubt but the prophet Iſaiah had a remote alluſion to this Arch-Rebel's aſpiring pride, and its fatal conſequences, in that prophetic triumph over the king of *Babylon*, exhibited in the following lofty paſſage.

" How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, " ſon of the morning! How art thou caſt down " to the ground which didſt weaken the nations!"

" For thou haſt ſaid in thine heart, I will aſcend " into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the " ſtars of God: I will ſit alſo upon the mount of " the congregation in the ſides of the north,"

" I will aſcend above the heights of the clouds, I " will be like the moſt High." Iſ. xiv. 12, 13, 14.

To theſe ſcriptural notices of that event may be added in confirmation of the truth of it many obvious alluſions, and even expreſs and poſitive declarations from ancient theologers.*

§ 8. But

---

* Minutius Felix's deſcription of demons is, " that their " motion is a *heavy ſinking* from heaven, and that they with- " draw from the *true God* to *matter*."—A Cœlo deorſum gravant et a Deo vero ad materiam avocant, vitam turbant omnes inquietant, irrepentes etiam corporibus occulti ut ſpiritus tenues: Morbos fingunt, terrent mentes membra diſtorquent ut ad cultum ſui cogant. Minut. Felix.

And Athenagoras ſays,—that when the angels were created, the things of the creation were committed to their care, and the prince of the apoſtate angels was originally the ruler, and preſi-

§ 8. But to proceed—To ſuch daring lengths of inſolent impiety did this Arch-Rebel proceed, that, notwithſtanding the galling defeat which he ſuſtained in Heaven, he, perſiſting ſtill in his avowed emulation, placed himſelf at the head of the Rebel-Rout, and erected at once, in deſpite of his Maker's power, or by his permiſſion rather, for wiſe and good purpoſes, a ſeparate antitheſtical ſovereignity. An aerial region was his deſtined reſidence, ſituated, as it is generally ſuppoſed, within the atmoſphere, or circumambient air of this our terreſtrial globe*.

---

preſident of the matter and forms that are in it. Ο της υλης, και των εν αυτη ειδων αρχων Apol. 27. 28. Gr. Nyſſen, and J. Damaſcen ſuppoſe, that when the world was created, the ſeveral parts of it were committed to ſeveral orders of angels, that he who was the devil, was prefect of the terrene order, having the preſidency over the earth, and the adminiſtration of terrene things. And the name by which the Rabins called the devil viz, מרוך ſignifying the apoſtate, is plainly alluſive to his apoſtacy from God; as is alſo another of his uſual appellations, viz. Satanas, or ſatan, the original import of which word is Αποστατης, Rebbellis.

The cabaliſtical book Zohar treating of lapſed angels ſays—God threw them down headlong, bound, and enchained—Theſe were *Aza* and *Azael*, which R. Eleazer ſays were two angels, which accuſed their Lord, and God caſt them out of the holy place headlong.

And the pagans diſcourſe of a ſort of evil genii, paſſively and penally ſuch, which Plutarch calls—Οι Θεηλατοι, και ερανοπετεις εκεινοι τυ Εμπεδοκλεους δαιμονιες.—"Thoſe God-"agitated, and heaven-fallen demons of Empedocles." See Brookleſby, p. 29, 30, 31.

* As other beings have their proper regions, ſo there is, ſays a Greek writer, a land or country of Satan, where the powers of darkneſs, and ſpirits of wickedneſs live and walk, and have their reſting place.

Ουτως εστι γη, και πατρις σατανικη ὑ διαγυσι, και εμπεριπατυσι, και επεναπαυονται αι δυναμεις τυ σκοτυ, και τα πνευματα της πονηριας. S. Macarius. Hom. 14.

CHAP. IX.

Human Souls ſhewn to have been complicated and involved in the guilt of the fallen angels.

§ 1. IN the foregoing chapter I gave the reader a ſummary account of the riſe, progreſs, and conſequence of that memorable event, the fall of thoſe Rebel angels, which ſcripture gives us in part, and which is ſhadowed out to us not obſcurely by Heathen, and Jewiſh theology.— And a moſt awful intereſting event it is! An event ſo comprehenſive as to its objects, as well as diffuſive of its miſchievous effects, as to have involved in ſin and miſery, the whole race of human beings. All nature ſhared in that original guilt, all nature groans now under the ruinous weight of it*. "The whole creation groaneth "and travelleth in pain of it until now." For lo! All who have trod this mother earth of ours (ſome few righteous ones only perhaps excepted) had aſſociated with the apoſtate powers, aſſimulated more or leſs with them in their various vices, joined them in their revolt from God, ranked with them under the banner of the vile uſurpur, aided his foul rebellion and became captives from that period more or leſs to his tyrannous

* By *nature* I wou'l not be underſtood to include here the *univerſe in general*, but that *ſublunary part* of *intelligent nature* to which we belong.

autho-

authority *. Elſe wherefore, in the firſt place, is it

* The author expreſſes himſelf here, in terms accommodated to the account given of that event, by the *Apocalyptic apoſtle*, who ſtiles it a *war in heaven*.——" There was war in heaven; *Michael* and his angels fought againſt the *Dragon*, and the Dragon fought and his angels." Apoc. xii. 7. The reader muſt therefore conſider the one in the ſame figurative point of view in which reaſon directs him to place the other. The viſion he alluded to was of both a *retroſpective* caſt, and *prophetic*, ſhewing that a train of devices, ſimilar to thoſe by which Satan (the dragon) aimed too ſucceſsfully to draw his fellow creatures, from their duty to their creator, and to inveigle them into acts of impiety, and moral obliquity in heaven, (all which were acts of rebellion againſt God) would be continued for a time by the divine permiſſion, (tho' with the like overthrow at laſt,) againſt the church or the *kingdom of heaven* to be eſtabliſhed upon earth; which appears very evidently to have been the caſe. vid. *Hammond*, and other commentators in Loco.

The only idea, therefore, which we can form of the fall of angels from the very ſhort account given us of it in ſcripture, is that of an apoſtacy (in one tribe or principality perhaps) from piety, and moral rectitude; which, conſtituting a kind of rebellion againſt the Majeſty of God, ſomewhat ſimilar to the revolt of a temporal colony, or province from the allegiance due to the lawful Sovereign, and that by the inſtigation, and under the command of a leader choſen from among themſelves, brought *all* at laſt under the ſame ſentence of expulſion or baniſhment from the divine preſence. But as the diſtinguiſhing eye of the Deity, when ſurveying the extenſive overthrow, could not but ſeparate, as intended objects for his future indulgence, the *leſſer* ſort of offenders from the greater, inſtead of aſſigning *us* a dwelling among thoſe, whom he *hath reſerved in everlaſting chains under darkneſs*, God has been pleaſed to give us a *probationary* abode *here*; which, though from its incidental calamities it may be reckoned a kind of *hell* compared with the felicities forfeited above, is an *heaven*, when contraſted with thoſe regions of miſery to which are doomed the firſt ſeducers of fallen man. The reader will not therefore be ſo undiſcerning, or unfair, as to charge me with ranking mankind in general with the *infernal*

it that ſcripture repreſents men in their *natural unregenerate* ſtate, not only as alienated from God and goodneſs, ſinners even from their birth, but as *connected* with the prince of thoſe powers that fell by *ties* of the moſt *intimate* kind, as creatures totally devoted to his ſervice, equally apt for diabolical practices, and of the ſame rank and quality in the ſcale of intellectual beings?

" When the ungodly curſeth Satan," ſays the wiſe ſon of *Sirach*, " he curſeth his own ſoul." Eccluſ. xxi. 27*.

Again, " Ye are of your father the devil," ſays our Saviour to the infidel Jews, " and the deeds, (τα ἐργα) " the works of your father ye will " do; intimating, that they, who had not only blaſphemouſly belied him, by telling him that he was a Samaritan, and had a *devil*, but had alſo gone

---

powers. No, my Hypotheſis does not require a belief ſo horrid; and the contrary is a plain poſitive ſcripture truth. For God (as ſays the Apoſtle) has not appointed us unto *Wrath*; but to obtain ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord. 1 Theſſ. 5. 9. Whatever may have been our connection with them in a prior ſtate, we are with reſpect to them, apparently now a detached ſpecies of beings, are brought into a region where drop continual dews of divine grace, are ſent hither as candidates for a reſtoration to our loſt happineſs (of which the others are not yet deemed worthy) with the ſeed, of a new, and divine life impregnated in us—the *ſeed of the woman* that will at length finally *break the ſerpent's head*. And the only *Criterion*, by which to determine what were our *reſpective ſhares* in a pre-exiſtent guilt, is that *natural taſte*, and diſpoſition of mind, with which we come into the world, and of which *ſelf-intuition* is the only unerring judge.

* Chriſt, ſays Chryſoſtom, from devils made men angels. απο δαιμονων αγγελες τες ανθρωπες ειργασατο. Chryſoſt. Hom. advers. Gent. 38. P. 737.

gone about to *kill him*, gave evident tokens of their affinity and affection to him who was " a " *murderer* from the beginning, and abode not in " the *truth*, becauſe there is no truth in him." John. viii. 41. 45.

Again, " He that committeth ſin," ſays St. John, " is of the devil, for the devil ſinneth from " the beginning." 1ſt. John iii. 8*.

Again. " Ye are from *beneath*," ſays our Saviour to the unbelieving Jews, " I am from above." John viii 23.---Ye are εκ των κατω, from the *powers below*, I am εκ των ανω, from the *powers above*. That is, *your* alliances, friendſhips, and connections, are with the powers *below*, *mine* with the powers *above*——An explanation of that paſſage, that will appear, I believe, when critically and fairly attended to perfectly juſt. And in fact, without ſuppoſing ſome ſuch prior connection with the *rulers* of the *darkneſs* of this world, with thoſe *ſpiritual wickedneſſes among the aerial inhabitants* †, the vicinity of our abode, to the place where dwell thoſe apoſtate powers‡; Satan's early and artful practices

---

* He that committeth ſin, That is, he that is in a *ſtate of ſin*, (in which we are all by nature,) " is of the devil," in like manner as he that is " *born of God*, *regenerate* and *born anew*, " ſinneth not," i. e. is not in a *ſtate of ſin*, is not under that pollution of ſoul with which he was born into this world.

† That is the true import of τα πνευματικα της πονηριας εν τοις επουρανιοις, in our tranſlation rendered ſpiritual wickedneſs in high places.

‡ The apoſtle ſpeaks of it as επουρανιος an *aerial abode*, and ſtiles Satan both the prince of the *devils*, and the prince of the *power*, (της εξουσιας) i. e. the *dominion* of the *air*. A moſt fatal vicinity this to the inhabitants of this world! For theſe refractory and rebellious ſpirits, though enchained under darkneſs, are yet permitted, we find, under cer-

tices upon our firſt parents, continued with too much ſucceſs ſtill upon their unhappy progeny; the ſovereignty he has been permitted to eſtabliſh here, and the various, ſubtle, and inſinuating, or elſe cruel and oppreſſive arts, by which it has ſo long been upheld*, are circumſtances in the courſe of the divine providence not eaſily, if at all reconcilable with our ideas of *God*, of infinite *juſtice*, *goodneſs*, and *mercy*. But an allowed preexiſtent concurrence with the fallen powers, as above ſuppoſed, clears away at once every the leaſt appearance of injuſtice, or inconſiſtency in the ways of God to man. Nor is it poſſible for any hypotheſis to ſtrike the reflecting unprejudiced mind with more force, and even irreſiſtibly. Come now then my dear reader and let us reaſon a little together with mutual impartiality.

§ 2. Had there ſubſiſted between man and the apoſtate powers, no kind of prior intercourſe, alliances, and connections, how comes it that we ſo frequently diſcern in one a ſpontaneous growth of intellectual principles, and affections ſo correſpondent altogether with thoſe by which are uſually characterized, and diſtinguiſhed the other? How is it that the undiſciplined, unregenerate heart of man ſends forth ſo plenteous an harveſt of corrupt paſſions, and deſires ſo diſgraceful to human nature,

---

certain limitations of their active powers, to *range about* the earth beneath. Job i. 7. Apoc. xvi. 13. where they have made it their conſtant buſineſs to ſeduce mankind into apoſtacy, to draw them off ſom their natural allegiance to God, and ſubject them to the prince of darkneſs. Col. 1. 13.

* ωςπερ γαρ το σωμα υπομοιχον διαφθειρεται ουτω και τι Ψυχη υπο λογισμων σατανικων πιαινεται υπο νοηματων διεφθαρμενων υπο νοηματων ατοπων. St. Chryſoſt. Hom. 23. de Judaic. Bapt. P. 279.

ture, ſo congenial to helliſh minds, and ſo impulſive at the ſame time to diabolical villanies, and horrid cruelties? ſhould we ranſack *hell* for impieties wherewith to offend *heaven*, for treachery, deceit, and fraud, formed to entrap, overreach, and ruin man, for barbarities exerciſed with the utmoſt unreſervedneſs and unrelentings, is it poſſible we could find *there* willing agents for either purpoſe more apt and accompliſhed than are to be found in almoſt every corner here*? Alas no!

§ 3. Men over partial to their own hearts, and their own actions (of which ſort much the major part of the world conſiſts) will think the above picture of *naked* nature, a piece unreſembling real life altogether, a portrait unjuſt, ungenerous, and ſhamefully unworthy an human pencil. What! ſhall a man dare to draw a true image of *God* in the ſemblance, and ſimilitude of a meer *devil?* Is there no honour, honeſty, or integrity in the heart of man? Is he totally abſorb'd in impiety iniquity, unjuſt, ungenerous, and unworthy purſuits? Has he no ſympathetic feelings of humanity? No tenderneſs and compaſſion for his fellow creatures? Is he not on the contrary a *fellow-ſufferer* in their wants, their misfortunes, their diſtreſſes? Does he not oftentimes put forth an eager hand to give bread to the hungry, to clothe the naked with a garment, and to

---

* Porro antem conpicimus homines, id eſt, animas ipſas; quid enim ſunt homines niſi animæ corporibus illigatæ? Alios vidimus immites, facineroſos, audaces, temerarios, præcipites, cæcos, fictos, diſſimulatores, audaces, ſuperbos, arrogantes, avaros, cupidos, libidinoſos; inconſtantes, invalidos & ſua ipſos decreta cenſervare nequeuntes. St. Cyp. Advers. Gent. Lib. Secund. P. 34. 35.

to releaſe from the loathſome priſon the inadvertent and unfortunate? If there are vices among men of the moſt heinous and deepeſt die, is there not an equal ballance at leaſt of the faireſt, and moſt reſpendent virtues? Has ſuch an one been an actual pilferer of your private property, a diſpoiler of your reputation, been falſe to your friendſhip, treacherous, and unfaithful to your confidence? Who is there that holds not each of theſe characters in the utmoſt deteſtation? Are there robbers, and deceivers of a more horid, diabolical caſt, men who prey upon the very vitals of their country, erecting a private opulence on the ruins of *public-intereſt*. Be it, that there are, or rather, have been men of ſuch enormous villany, yet does there not ſtep forth now and then one armed with the breaſt-plate of patriotic virtue, of a ſteady unwearied reſolution to vanquiſh the deſtructive *Hydra?* Does again impiety, infidelity, or atheiſm rear its impudent head againſt Heaven;—a ſelf-aſſuming, ſelf-ſufficient, half-reaſoning, *nothing?*

" Who but muſt laugh, if ſuch a man there be?
" Who wou'd not weep, if B—— were he?

§ 4. Does again hypocriſy wear the maſque of devotion, covetouſneſs that of frugality, and treachery put on the face of friendſhip? Allowing, that there are of theſe deſpicable characters, not a few, yet why muſt the men of true piety, generoſity, and diſintereſted worth, be overlooked? And do not in reality the latter, if thrown in the ſcale of obſervation, and actual experience, equipoiſe, as I obſerved before, if not overbalance the utmoſt weight you can make up from the for-

former? Wherefore then this crying invective againſt human nature? Wherefore ſo unamiable, ſo unbecoming, ſo unreſembling a picture of man? as a portrait I mean of the whole ſpecies.

§ 5. This is a ſuppoſed charge of injuſtice to the moral character of my fellow creatures, which I have obviated in a great meaſure above; if not however to the reader's entire ſatisfaction, I muſt requeſt his attention to what follows.

Are there then thoſe who may with propriety be ranked in the number of the religious, juſt, generous, friendly, tender-hearted and compaſſionate? are there thoſe who are lovers of their neighbour and country in preference to any mean, dirty, worthleſs conſiderations with reſpect to themſelves? Are there thoſe who are poſſeſſed of a conſcience void of offence towards God and towards men? Be it that there are, Yet to what ſource, let me aſk, can any of theſe aſcribe their acknowledged happineſs? If it ariſes not *wholly* and *ſolely* from *nature*, or rather unleſs nature, *unaſſiſted*, *uninſtructed*, *uneducated*, *unregenerate* nature infuſes ſuch good principles in the hearts of all men *univerſally*, and in the ſame proportion, which ſcripture and experience prove not to be the caſe, my Hypotheſis ſtands on ſure ground: Is it then from *education*, that men deduce the happy exemption from flagrant vice? Do they owe it to any ſalutary *precepts*, enforced by engaging *examples*, or to thoſe more efficacious means for attaining it, the invigorating regenerating influences of the *divine ſpirit*? What will even this, I would aſk, prove? Why nothing more or leſs in

ſhort, than that many of us, by the benefit of thoſe aids above ſuppoſed, eſcape being the abandoned wretches we ſhould have been *without* them. But to make a true eſtimate of this boaſted image of *God*, *Man*, we muſt eraſe all its *artificial ſculptured* graces, and embelliſhments, ſtrip it of the *borrowed ornaments*, and decent drapery of *erudition*, &c. and view it devoid even of that *righteouſneſs, which is of faith*. The miſchief is, we look only at the *fair ſide* of the object, becauſe there the view, though *imperfect*, and *incompleat*, is the more *engaging*, not conſidering, that if we examined the *other ſide*, or explored human nature, where ſhe appears in her native dreſs, we ſhould ſee a picture of wretchedneſs and horror. We forget what a ſmall portion of *nature* is ſeen by the eye of common obſervation. An *infiniteſſimal* part only (as the mathematicians word it) appears of what is called the *world*; and this it is, that makes us judge ſo erroneouſly when ſpeaking of nature's *native amplitude*. Indulge but one moment's reflection on the horrid barbarities of the *ſavage*, i. e. the undiſciplined uneducated unregenerated unchriſtianized *Indians*, and " to what can we with propriety liken " that generation"—but to a race of *demi-devils*, to a " generation of vipers," whom for their more extraordinary *impieties* in a *prior* ſtate, providence does not pleaſe to enable as yet, to " flee from the wrath to come."

§ 6. In ſhort, the nature and tenor of the goſpel diſpenſation ſuppoſe, of courſe, the Indian world to be under the power and dominion of ſin, and Satan, or what can ſcripture mean by declaring, that the *unregenerate* are *aliens* from *God* and *goodneſs*, children of *wrath*, children of the *devil?*

Can

Can we wonder then at thoſe ſhocking *cruelties*, and *unfeeling* practices, to which they are ſo notoriouſly familiarized, and accuſtomed? Who is the *God*, that directs, and rules *their* hearts? Is it the *God* of *Heaven*; Alas! no. Him they had deſerted, and to his favour are not yet reſtored. They are aliens from God and under the power of the evil one, and while they remain unconverted, muſt continue in that ſtate of bondage*; or Chriſtianity, the (ſuppoſed) ſole reſtorer of fallen man to God, and deliverer from the power of Satan, means I know not what. Do *they* then, as well as millions of others more refined, more civilized, more moralized, but alas! not chriſtianized, do they *all*, I ſay, labour under the tyrany of the *devil*, and *his works* will they do? Why they are *his own*, (ſcripture I think authorizes me ſo to ſpeak) "he comes to his own, and his "own receive him, alas! too naturally, and "affectionately."—This is in effect the language of Chriſtianity, or Chriſtianity is, and ſpeaks I know not what†.

§ 7. Again, Without ſuppoſing a prior connection with the apoſtate powers, how is it poſſible to account for that *early deflection* in our primogenial parents from *moral rectitude*, by which they for-

* What may be the fate of thoſe who die in that ſtate, I ſhall conſider hereafter. Let it not however be haſtily concluded in the mean time, that *all* who are objects of the divine wrath *here*, muſt neceſſarily remain ſuch *hereafter*.

† If in this declaration I ſhould be proved to be in the wrong, by fair arguments, I ſhall with the utmoſt ſincerity and compunction, beg pardon of God, and man, for publiſhing to the world ſo extraordinary an hypotheſis. In the mean time I muſt own, that the more I contemplate the doctrine of a lapſe of human ſouls in a ſtate of pre-exiſtence in this light, the more I am confirmed in my belief of it; and the more ſo, as it ſerves ſo effectually to render *Chriſtianity* ſo worthy of all acceptation; which I hope to make appear very ſufficiently from what follows.

feited, in violation of the ſtrongeſt ties of duty, gratitude, and natural affection, their Maker's regard, involved themſelves, and their poſterity, in ſcenes of the deepeſt diſtreſs, adding freſh triumph to the too ſucceſsful diſturber of Heaven's repoſe? What but hearts already alienated from the love of God, could have yielded ſo very readily to the beguiling enticements of ſo open a traducer of God's authority, goodneſs, and juſtice? What but a depravity of mind acquired in a *prior*, could have given birth to ſo foul a procedure in their *ſubſequent* paradiſaical ſtate*? That the long train

* It will be objected, that if our firſt parent's obliquity in Eden is neceſſarily to be aſcribed to a *Pre-diſpoſition* of mind to unrighteouſneſs, diſobedience and impiety, it will follow that their ſuppoſed aſſociation with the apoſtate powers, and the fall of the tempter and the apoſtate powers themſelves aroſe from a ſimilar ſource.

The force of this objection will, I imagine, be eaſily removed by conſidering, that enormous as were the crimes by which the fallen angels forfeited heaven, and in which I ſuppoſe our firſt parents to have been involved, they took not their riſe either in the one or the other, from a wicked and perverſe will, as did the *latter's* treſpaſs in *Paradiſe*, but from a weak and perverted imagination. That *finite* beings may and muſt be ſubject to the *latter* we cannot doubt, without attributing to the creature (what can with propriety be attributed to the Creator only) an all-perfect and unerring wiſdom.

The *nemo repente fuit turpiſſimus* may be applied to angels as well as men. Nor can we with any the leaſt foundation in reaſon ſuppoſe, but that the fall of the apoſtate powers was effected by *degrees*, by a courſe of *inſenſible* deviations from moral rectitude; which cannot be urged in behalf of our firſt parents early treſpaſs in paradiſe.

That beings of the higheſt order in the regions of bliſs, and moving in a ſphere of dignity, pre-heminence and glory too exalted and enrapturing by far for human thought to conceive—that beings *(created*, and of courſe *frail fallible* beings I mean) ſo dignified, ſo exalted, ſo highly favoured of Heaven, ſhould

train of villanies, and impieties, which ſucceeded their horrid tranſgreſſion, ſhould ariſe from the ſame ſource, we can eaſily enough conceive. Nor can we wonder in the leaſt at Cain's committing murder, when we are told that "the *devil* was "a murderer from the beginning, and that "*Cain* was of that evil one." And how uninterrupted the ſucceſſion of moral evil was till it terminated in an almoſt entire extinction of the human ſpecies by a judicial flood, we read with *horror* indeed, but with little or no *ſurprize:* and in the ſame manner are we affected, when contemplating that *torrent* of vice and impiety which deluged the whole ſucceeding race of mortals,

---

ſhould be dazzled, as it were, with their own ſplendor, ſo as to loſe ſight at laſt of that great LUMINARY to which they ſtood indebted for their eximious luſtre—Is not this, I ſay, conceivable? Is it not poſſible? Is it not in ſhort probable? And might not ſelf-admiration, *naturally* reſulting from a fancied ſelf-conſequence, by *inſenſible* degrees lead to ſelf-ſufficiency, ſelf-ſufficiency to independency, and independency by degrees to open rebellion, to a *gradual* violation I mean of thoſe fundamental laws of heaven, humility and a due obedience to their Creator? That ignis fatuus of the mind, in ſhort, ſelf-admiration, *naturally* reſulting, as I ſaid, from a fancied ſelf-conſequence, might by *imperceptible* means lead the apoſtate powers to that oppoſition to their Maker's authority for which they were baniſhed their celeſtial habitations. But ſuch a *gradual inſenſible* deviation from original rectitude was not the nature of our firſt parents treſpaſs in Paradiſe. They ran counter to their Maker's will at once and without heſitation. The aſpiring Principles by which they before fell reigned triumphant in their hearts ſtill, and there needed not a more powerful allurement by which the tempter drew them into the ſnare laid for them, than the promiſe of their becoming God's. God doth know, ſays he, that in the day that thou eateſt thereof (of the fruit of the tree) ye ſhall be as gods.

A ſufficient anſwer this, I hope, to the objection ſuppoſed above.

who

who were afterwards all *concluded under ſin*, and ſerved only to compoſe a *world lying in wickedneſs*. Nor is any thing more evident from ſcripture, and the hiſtory of ages paſt, than that the Heathen world conſiſted in general, of a moſt helpleſs, hopeleſs, abandon'd race of animals; wretches from whom the God of all power and might had withdrawn *for a time* the arm of protection, diſcarded them from his favour and affection, baniſhed them his divine preſence, and aſſigned them over to the ſole guidance of his rival, the prince of darkneſs.

Having now given the reader my reaſons for imagining that human ſouls were complicated and involved in the guilt of the fallen angels, by an aſſociation with thoſe apoſtate powers, I proceed now to ſhew that that lapſe of human ſouls in a ſtate of pre-exiſtence, is moſt propably the only *original ſin* and the *ground work of the goſpel diſpenſation*.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

A lapſe from original righteouſneſs, by an aſſociation with the apoſtate powers, the only original ſin, and the ground-work of the goſpel diſpenſation.

§ 1. ARE we not evidently repreſented in ſcripture as born in ſin, by nature the children of wrath, and under the power and dominion of ſin and Satan? Do we not come into the world with a load of guilt upon our ſouls, with ſome foul ſtains in our intellectual frame, by which the original dignity of our nature is debaſed? And is not the exalted deſign of the goſpel œconomy to expiate and attone for that original guilt, to purify our corrupted nature, to reſcue us from the powers of darkneſs, and to reinſtate us into the glorious liberty of the ſons of God? But this guilt, what in the name of reaſon can it be? And theſe intellectual and moral impurities what and whence can be their nature and origin? *That* guilt can it poſſibly be any thing elſe than of a perſonal kind? And thoſe mental impurities where can we ſuppoſe them to have been contracted*, but with thoſe very corrupt and impure ſpirits who are now ſo aſſiduous in renewing and encreaſing them within us.

§ 2. But further ſtill---Is the guilt with which, according to the opinion of our church we ſtand indicted at our birth (ſee p. 106) of ſo malignant, horrid and deſtructive a nature, as that in every

* For *contracted* they muſt have been, or *infuſed* by our *Creator*; if the latter, then the *Author of Nature* is the *Author of Evil.*

perſon

perſon born into the world, it deſerves, as our article ſpeaks, God's wrath and indignation; and is it at the ſame time no *real* crime of our own? Till our Saviour became the *Mediator of the new Teſtament, and taſted Death for every Man*——*Till he finiſhed Tranſgreſſion and made an end of ſin*, were the inhabitants of this world to be conſidered indiſcriminately as objects of the divine vengeance *on account of Adam's treſpaſs in Paradiſe?* That that could not be the opinion of thoſe who framed our article concerning original ſin, I have endeavoured to ſhew in my comment on that article. That there is however a depravity and ſinfulneſs in the nature of man, ſcripture and experience as we have ſeen above, ſufficiently evince. And whether that depravity &c. of nature did not ariſe from *ſome* lapſe from original righteouſneſs, an aſſociation moſt probably with the apoſtate powers, for reaſons given in the preceding chapter, and whether *that* therefore is not the only original ſin and the ground-work of the goſpel diſpenſation, I wiſh the reader would conſider ſeriouſly and impartially.

§ 3. Oh! No ſay the reverend the Diſſenting clergy, *Original Sin* is what we know nothing at all of, there is no warrant from ſcripture for a belief of any ſuch doctrine—Nor is there any other guilt from which men are redeemed by virtue of our Saviour's mediation, *&c.* but what ariſes from their *perſonal* treſpaſſes here. No, Gentlemen? Is *that* in reality your belief, and *that* your Idea of Chriſtianity? Why then I muſt take the liberty to aſſure you, that your conceptions of Chriſtianity are far ſhort of the true idea of it, and you under-rate its noble and exalted purpoſes moſt lamentably.

When

When John ſeeth Jeſus coming to him, he ſaith —Behold the lamb of God which taketh away the *ſin* αμαρτιαν the *ſin*, not the *ſins* of the world, alluding, moſt aſſuredly, to that one *univerſal* ſin with which every man comes into the world, and from the guilt of which he is redeemed by Chriſt, which will more clearly appear in the courſe of my *application* of the above hypotheſis; to which I ſhall haſten after having anſwered the principal objections that may be brought againſt the hypotheſis, referring the reader in the mean time to a note below * for an anſwer to ſome arguments brought

---

* Dr. Taylor obſerves upon the under-written texts of ſcripture (*a*) quoted in the aſſembly of divines Catechiſm, as proofs of the "corruption of man's nature, whereby he is "utterly indiſpoſed, diſabled, and made oppoſite unto all "that is ſpiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, "and that continually," as follows.

Obſ.

(*a*) Rom. iii. 10, 20. As it is written there is none righteous, no not one. Ver. xi. There is none that underſtandeth, there is none that ſeeketh after God.

Pſal. xiv. 1, 2, 3. Ver. 12. They are all gone out of the way, they are all become unprofitable, there is none that doeth good, no not one.

Pſal. v. 9. Ver. 13. Their throat is an open ſepulchre, with their tongues they have uſed deceit, the poiſon of aſps is under their lips:

Pſal. iii. 3. Ver. 14. Whoſe mouth is full of curſing and bitterneſs. Ver. 15. Their feet are ſwift to ſhed blood.

Pſal. x. 7. Ver. 16. Deſtruction and miſery are in their ways.

Prov. i. 16. Ver. 17. And the way of peace have they not known.

Iſa. liii. 7, 8. Ver. 18. There is no fear of God before their eyes.

Pſal. xxxvi. 1. Ver. 19. Now we know that whatſoever things the law ſaith, it ſaith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be ſtopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.

brought by Dr. Taylor, to prove that our Saviour lived and died only to redeem mankind from the

---

Obſ. 3 The ſection, ſays he, conſiſts of ſeveral quotations out of the Old Teſtament, called here *the law*, ver. 19. But, 1ſt, In none of them, taken ſeparately, doth the Sriit of God ſpeak of any *depravity of nature* derived from Adam, (granted) but manifeſtly of the habits of wickedneſs, which men had *contracted* by their *own* evil doings; as will I think, undeniably appear, if you carefully peruſe the texts ſet over-againſt the proofs in the margin. And in Pſal. x. 4. the wickedneſs of the wicked is expreſsly ſaid, ſays he, to conſiſt in this, that he will not *ſeek after God.* And that *God is not in all his thoughts.* He *might* ſeek after God, but he *will* not. He hath thoughts; a power to think of God, but he doth not uſe it, p. 103. What immediately follows is ſo much to the doctor's diſcredit, as a reaſoner, that I wiſh it could be wiped out of his book. And it is amazing, that one of Dr. Taylor's ſagacity and penetration, ſhould bring, all along, arguments in ſupport of his hypotheſis, which are ſo *apparently* ſubverſive of it.

The ſpirit of God, ſays he, does not, in either of the above-quoted texts, ſpeak of *any* depravity of nature (for that is in general his meaning.) How ſo? Why, he, the Spirit of God, alludes only to the wickedneſs which men had contracted by their *own* evil doings—and the Pſalmiſt expreſly ſays, that the wickedneſs of the wicked conſiſted in this—that he *will not ſeek after* God, that *God is not in all his thoughts*—He *might* ſeek after God; but he *will not*, &c.

Now, if an *habitual*, *voluntary* propenſity to *evil doings*, a ſettled, determined abjuration of God, implied in their *wilfully not* ſeeking him, be not evidences of the *depravity*, &c. of human nature, I know not what can, in the nature of things, be rationally deemed ſuch. Taking this therefore for granted, what ſtronger proofs need be required of the *depravity*, &c. of human nature, than what Dr. *Taylor* has above advanced? But to ſhew that the *texts of ſcripture*, there alluded to, are deſigned *declarations* of the depravity and corruption of man's NATURE, be pleaſed to attend to the following obſervations.

Dr. Taylor ſays (Obſerv. 2. p. 102.) The apoſtle is not, in the above ſection, ſpeaking of all mankind, but a very ſmall part of mankind, viz. the Jews, who alone were then *under the law*, ver. 12. and he is proving from thoſe places, in their own approved writings (which places ſpeak *of* as well

the guilt and puniſhment due to their reſpective tranſgreſſions *here*.

---

well as *to* the natural *Jews*) that there were very great corruptions among them, as well as among other people." But how does this quadrate with——*God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to ſee if there were any that would underſtand and ſeek after God. But they are all*, &c. &c.? Pſal. xiv. 3, 4. (I am ſorry to ſee the doctor ſubſtituting *did* underſtand for *would* underſtand.) It ſeems, in ſhort, to me, very evident, that David ſpeaks as *univerſally* in the above texts, with reſpect to the corruption of mankind, as Iſaiah does in the 53d chapter—All *we like ſheep have gone aſtray, we have turned every one his own* WAY; *and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us* all, ver. 6. and that antecedently to the juſtification and regeneration to be obtained by a true *operative* faith in Chriſt, the world, (in *general* I mean) is, as it always was, abundant in corrupt propenſions.

But again—The next proof urged by the aſſembly of divines, in the demonſtration of the corruption of human nature, is from Epheſ. chap. ii. ver. 1, 2, 3. upon which, ſays Dr. Taylor—In theſe verſes the apoſtle is deſcribing the wretched and deplorable ſtate of the Epheſians, while they were in GENTILE DARKNESS, in order to illuſtrate and magnify the grace of God in calling them to the knowledge and privileges of the goſpel—and when he ſaith, they were dead in *treſpaſſes* and *ſins*, he plainly ſpeaks of their own perſonal iniquities, &c.—committed through the darkneſs and *degeneracy* of their minds, p. 148, 109. And then ſays he, when the apoſtle adds—*and were by nature the children of wrath*, he cannot mean, that they were liable to divine wrath or puniſhment *by* that nature which they brought into the world at their birth—for, as God's *hands have faſhioned and formed us—every one of us*—to ſay the nature *He* gives is the hateful object of his wrath, is little leſs than blaſphemy againſt our good and bountiful Creator, p. 110—Very right: and the inference therefrom is manifeſtly what? Why that, ſuppoſing the nature of man to be corrupt from his cradle, it could not come hither *immediately* from the hands of his Creator. But that men are *not corrupt* from their birth, and on that account *children of wrath*, he proves, In what manner? Why nature *here*, ſays he, may ſignify *really, properly, truly*. For obſerve τεκνα *children*, ſtrictly ſignifieth the genuine children of parents, by natural generation. But the word is uſed figuratively alſo, to denote relation to a perſon or thing by

by way of friendſhip, regard, imitation, obligation, &c. The *children* of *God*, of the *kingdom*, the *bridegroom*, the *reſurrection*, of *wiſdom*, *light*, *obedience*, *peace*, &c. The *children of wrath* are they who are related to wrath, or liable to rejection and puniſhment. And whereas in thoſe days ſome were children in a lower ſenſe, by *adoption*; ſome in a higher, by *nature*, or proper generation; the apoſtle tells the Epheſians, they were *by nature* children; that is to ſay, children of wrath, or related to wrath, in the moſt real and *proper* ſenſe; as he is a child in the moſt real and proper ſenſe who is one *by nature*, p. 113.

If here, again, the doctor is not (ſophiſtry, I mean, apart) *quoting* and *proving* againſt himſelf, there is a myſtery in his reaſoning which I cannot unfold. In fact, by the ημεν τεκνα φυσει οργης the apoſtle can mean nothing more or leſs than that they were by *birth*, or in other words, by the *native*, *conſtitutional*, *unregenerate frame* of their minds, (that *frame* of mind I mean with which they make their *firſt* appearance *here*.) Children of wrath; were (φυσει) as *truly* and *eſſentially* deſtitute of *divine grace*, and, as *ſuch*, objects of the divine wrath, as were thoſe counterfeit gods to which the Galatians did ſervice, Gal. iv. 8. (as the ſame apoſtle ſpeaks) φυσει — *eſſentially no Gods*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Objections to the doctrine of a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls ſtated and removed.

OBJECTION I.

§ 1. IT will be aſked by way of objection to the doctrine of a pre-exiſtence, *&c.* of human ſouls, how it is poſſible that we ſhould have exiſted in a prior ſtate without being able now to form any idea of that State, without having any conſciouſneſs of the ſoul's operations therein, any *revived* images on our minds of celeſtial gratifications paſt, or inherent remorſe on our Conſciences for the ſuppoſed crimes by which they were forfeited, but that all ſhould be buried in one eternal gulf of oblivion.

If this be an objection ſeemingly formidable at firſt view, it will not, I believe, be found, upon examination, to have ſo much weight as is uſually aſcribed to it.

§ 2. The moſt rational, comprehenſive, and I believe the only true definition of the ſoul of man, is this, viz. that it is a ſpirit, whoſe immediate properties are *ſelf* motion or activity, *ſelf*-penetration, *ſelf*-contraction and dilatation, together with a power of *penetrating*, *moving*, *altering* (or rather determining the motion of) matter *,—properties

* The ſoul, has not any *power*, or but very little, of moving matter; but her peculiar *privilege* is of determining matter in motion. for if it were an immediate faculty of the ſoul, to *contribute* motion to matter, I do not underſtand how that faculty, never failing or diminiſhing, no more than the ſoul itſelf can fail or diminiſh, we ſhould ever be weary of motion, Dr. More, Immor. b. 2. c. 8. p. 7.

to

to which are neceſſarily annexed the powers of perception, animadverſion, thought, reaſon, reflection, choice. Theſe are the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of the ſoul of man; theſe the peculiar properties, which evince its conſtitutional frame to be eſſentially different from groſs matter. As *eſſentials*, therefore, they muſt of courſe be coeval with its firſt formation*; whence it follows naturally, that

* Since it is evident, that matter is a dead ſubſtance in all reſpects, it follows, that an immaterial ſubſtance, or the ſoul, is the *only thing* in us that hath active power. And ſince it hath active power, that power muſt inhere in it, as in its ſubject; or the power muſt belong to the ſoul as a *property of its nature*. It cannot belong to the ſoul, as a mere accident; for power cannot be produced by accident, or a being cannot be endowed with powers by accident; for then we ſhall never be able to ſtop any where; all power might be thus produced by accident, and we muſt give up the *principles of reaſoning*. And ſince *active power* muſt belong to the ſoul, as a property of its nature, that property cannot be ſeparated from it, without deſtroying its nature altogether. For certainly *power* is the greateſt perfection of being, as the want of power is the greateſt imperfection. And a being cannot be deprived of the perfection of its nature, without having its nature altogether deſtroyed. This active power could no more be ſeparated from the ſoul, without an act of Omnipotence to deſtroy its nature, than ſolidity (or *inactivity*) could be ſeparated from matter, without an act of Omnipotence to deſtroy the nature of matter. And indeed it is abſolutely neceſſary, that as one ſpecies of ſubſtance, *matter*, is utterly inactive by its nature and conſtitution, ſo another ſpecies of it, *ſpirit*, ſhould have activity and power by its nature and conſtitution. Vid. Baxter's Enquiry into the Nature of human Soul. V. 1. p. 553, &c.

If activity, then, is thus eſſential to the nature of the ſoul, thought and perception muſt be ſo too. For to be active without being percipient of the action, as the ſame writer obſerves, is to be active, not from an *internal principle*, or the power of action, but from *mechanical neceſſity*. To be active implies the *will* to act; and there can be no *will*, but what is determined by a greater or leſs degree of thought, reaſon, reflection, and choice. And wherever there is ſenſe of perception, ſays Mr. Locke, there ſome idea is actually produced, and preſent in the underſtanding. B. 2. c. 9. ſect. 4.

The very loweſt kind of life, ſays Baxter, ſeems to conſiſt in

that there muſt have exiſted in the ſoul a ſeries of thought, reaſon, reflection, &c. previous to its entrance into this world; unleſs we can ſuppoſe its *generation in the womb* to be in reality its firſt formation; an idea in which is involved the groſſeſt abſurdity, not to give it a worſe name; making the Creator, in fact, a coadjutor in the works of fornication, adultery, inceſt†.

§ 3. Canſt thou then, whoſoever thou art, to whom the *above* objection ſeems to be of any weight, tell me what paſſed in thy mind, when thou iſſuedſt firſt from the hands of thy Creator, and waſt made a living ſoul? Tell me, if thou canſt, what

---

in the perceptive capacity; ſo that we can never imagine this removed from a living being. And again, ſays he, it does not ſtand in need of the action of external matter upon it to become percipient. V. 1. p. 267.

† A reflection this, to which the reader will give, I hope, the due attention, and not forget that *this* is the inference which *unavoidably* follows from a ſuppoſed *daily* creation of ſouls. How much more conſentaneous to reaſon therefore, is it, to conclude, agreeably to the ſentiments of the moſt rational philoſophers, that *all* ſouls were created from the beginning of things, by one Almighty Fiat, and that ſome of them having ſinned in their firſt ſtate, (the probability, if not actual certainty of which, we hope we have already ſhewn from reaſon, and from ſcripture likewiſe) were detruded from their celeſtial abode, into an aerial one; from whence, after having acquired a vital congruity with matter duly prepared for the reception of ſuch of the fallen powers as ſhall be deemed worthy to enter into *this* probationary ſcene of action, ſucceſſively drop *of courſe* (or rather Providentiæ ſive Animæ Mundi Lege) into a terreſtrial habitation. By the above mentioned *aerial abode*, however, I do not mean, that *purer* region to which the ſoul will aſcend, if properly *purified* here, when ſeparated from the body, but that groſs circumambient atmoſphere of the earth, where dwell the *chief* of the apoſtate powers; with whom a more *refined*, or rather leſs *corrupt* order of lapſed beings may as reaſonably be ſuppoſed to cohabit, as good and bad *men* be intermixed with each other, and *both* with furious beaſts, and other noxious animals, in this their terreſtrial habitation.

were

were at that period thy reaſonings, thy reflections? What, I pray thee, were thy perceptions, what the ſtate of thy thoughts, when God faſhioned thee in the womb, and when thou laydeſt there for nine months*? And afterwards, when thou firſt hangedſt

---

* Whether immediately upon conception *(a)*, or not till the embryo of the future man is formed into a fœtus, the ſoul drops into the womb, it is not neceſſary, or perhaps eaſy to determine, tho' the latter ſeems moſt probable; we may however reaſonably conclude that, the neceſſary diſpoſition of parts being made for its reception, the ſoul becomes, by a derived power from its Creator, a kind of *ſubordinate architect* of its own manſion, raiſing itſelf, by a conſtant exextion of its plaſtic powers on the *encreaſing* matter (ariſing from a regular ſupply of food) from its *diminutive* form, when iſſuing from the womb, to the *determinate* bulk of man. Agreeably to which, ſays St. Cyprian. Caro Spiritu, (meaning by Spiritu, the ſoul moſt undoubtedly) inſtructa nutritur, adoleſcit, affatur, docet, operatur. Rigalt. in opuſc. St. Cyprian. And to the ſame effect, ſays Dr. More—In every particular world ſuch as man is, ſays he, his own ſoul is the peculiar and moſt perfect architect, and being a *ſpirit*, and therefore contractable and dilatable, it begins within leſs compaſs at firſt in organizing the fitly-prepared matter, and ſo bears itſelf on the ſame tenor of work, till the body has attained its full growth, dilates itſelf in dilating the body, and poſſeſſes it through all the members thereof. Vid. More, Immor. b. 2. c. 10.

A conjecture this, than which there cannot be one more rationally pleaſing, as it ſerves to account ſo ſatisfactorily, not only for the gradual growth of the corporeal frame of man, but for the gradual improvement likewiſe of his intellectual powers and faculties. For till the ſoul can have worked the body up to its proper organization and conformity of parts (which it can only effect by degrees) by virtue of its plaſtic faculty; till, in ſhort, the nerves, and thoſe other more *immediate* inſtruments of ſenſe, motion, and organization, the *animal*

(a) By conception, I mean the impregnation of the ovum (wherein is contained the firſt rudiments of the human body) by the ſemen virile; for a very rational ſatisfactory illuſtration of which point, I muſt refer the reader to Dr. Parſons's ingenious treatiſe on the analogy between the propagation of animals and vegetables.

hangedſt on thy mother's breaſt, doſt thou remember what gave thee thy pains, and thy ſorrows,

---

animal ſpirits, are rendered ſo complete as to be able to tranſmit the impreſſion of ſenſible objects to the brain, wherein centers the perceptive faculty of the ſoul, there muſt of courſe be a debility of both the corporeal and intellectual operations; but neither philoſophy nor common ſenſe will allow us to conclude, that the ſoul is totally void of ſenſe and reflection, when it enters into and begins its operations upon the corporeal frame, *becauſe* it diſcovers not that ſublimity or extenſiveneſs of reaſoning, to which a more complete organization of its material vehicle (or vivification, rather, of its organic powers) is requiſite.

I doubt not, ſays Mr. Locke, but children, by the exerciſe of their ſenſes about objects that affect them in the womb, receive ſome few ideas before they are *born*, as the unavoidable effects either of the bodies that environ them, or elſe of theſe wants or deſires that affect them;—ſuch as hunger, warmth, &c. B. 2. c. 9. ſect. 5. And though the ſoul, ſays, a very ingenious modern French writer, aſtoniſhed and ſurpriſed to find itſelf confined and impriſoned, may, during the firſt days of life, remain in a ſtate of ſtupidity and dulneſs, it does not follow, that ſhe is not properly awake till ſhe begins to reaſon: on the contrary, ſhe is quickly rouſed by the calls of neceſſity; the organs ſoon inform her that they ſtand in need of her orders, and the correſpondence between body and ſoul is eſtabliſhed by means of the reciprocal impreſſions they make on each other. From that inſtant the ſoul broods in ſilence over her faculties, which in due time ſhe properly prepares and brings forth into action. By the help and miniſtry of the eye, the ear, the feeling, and the other ſenſes, ſhe aſſembles a ſet of lights and ideas which ſerve her as proviſions for life; and as it is the *ſentiment* that alone preſides over and directs all theſe acquiſitions, it neceſſarily follows, that it muſt have already made a very conſiderable progreſs, before *reaſon* has begun to exert herſelf, or even taken the firſt ſtep. It gives me no ſmall degree of pleaſure, and even pride, to find my own ſentiments, as above advanced, countenanced ſince ſo ſtrongly by ſo extremely ſenſible and ingenious a writer, as is the abbot Batteau, from whom the above is taken. Vid. *His Principles of Literature*,—tranſlated by Mr. Millar. But to return. The debility and habitude of the ſoul's intellectual powers during infancy (and ſomething ſimilar may perhaps be the caſe with it, when in

rows, and what drew from thee thy ſtrong crying? Has thy mind ſtill a feeling of thoſe pains, and thoſe

---

the womb) Dr. More aſcribes, not irrationally I think, to the then ſtate and condition of the animal ſpirits (*a*), which being, as he ſays, more torpid and watery in children and old men, muſt needs hinder her in ſuch operations as require another conſtitution of ſpirits; though I will not profeſs myſelf abſolutely, ſays he, confident, that the ſoul cannot act without all dependence on matter; but if it does not, which is moſt probable, it muſt needs follow, that its operations will keep the laws of the body it is united to; whence it is demonſtrable, adds he, how neceſſary purity and temperance is to preſerve and advance a man's parts. Vid. p. 206. The truth of this latter remark cannot but be obvious to any one, who conſiders how intimately the operations of the ſoul depend upon the temper and tenor of thoſe *immediate* inſtruments of reaſon and reflection *here the animal ſpirits*. And how important the conſideration is, not only with reſpect to mens *parts*, but to their *principles* alſo, will appear from the following reflections, which, though digreſſive not a little from the point immediately under conſideration, will not, however, be altogether unacceptable, I hope, to the ſpeculative reader.

Thoſe animal ſpirits, then, above mentioned, are a ſecretion of the blood, perpetually ariſing from the heart, which the ſoul is neceſſitated, by her union with the body, to make uſe of in her intellectual as well as ſenſitive operations—I mean in the powers of thought, meditation, reflection, &c. Whatever, therefore, tends moſt to a fuller and more *pure* ſupply of the one, gives the ſoul of courſe a proportionably more enlarged and enlivened aptitude for the other. And from a peculiar happy temperature and tenor of the animal ſpirits, with which ſome are naturally furniſhed, it is, that they are poſſeſſed of proportionably quicker, livelier, and brighter parts, than others: the ſoul's intellectual operations being by that means more free and diſincumbered, and better

(*a*) Theſe though looked on by ſome as an imaginary ſubſtance only, are an actual *fluid*, diſcernable by the microſcopic eye (perpetually emiſſive from and reverſive into its lodgment within the fourth ventricle of the brain, wherein alſo reſides its chief directrix, the ſoul) by the inſtrumentality of which are performed all the operations of the ſoul, ſenſitive and intellectual, and are ſufficient to anſwer *all* thoſe purpoſes for which ſome, abſurdly enough, ſuppoſe a *ſenſitive* ſoul is united to the *rational*.

thoſe ſorrows? Art thou even conſcious, that thou hadſt them? and yet that thou didſt feel them at

---

ter adapted for clear, cloſe, ſagacious, and ſolid reaſoning, or for the more copious and exalted efforts of *imagination*, which ever of theſe ſhall happen to be her *native* turn.

And as by means of a different temperature and tenor of the animal ſpirits, men are found to differ from one another, with reſpect to their intellectual *powers*, and *endowments*, ſo to the like cauſe are we to aſcribe, generally ſpeaking, their difference from each other in point of *temper*, *paſſions*, and intellectual *affections*. The more pure and tenuous the animal ſpirits are, the more *pure* and *pious*, for the moſt part, will be the latter—I mean pure and pious affections will then more eaſily take place—and not only this, but be more permanent active and vigorous at the ſame time; as the ſoul will then have a clearer and more ſtriking conception of the beloved object, a more open and free paſſage for its devout aſpirations, a greater ſcope for ſpiritual enlargements, and an eagerneſs therein, that will not eaſily keep clear of extravagance. Hence it is, that *real* piety ſo frequently terminates in *enthuſiaſm*; *that* abſtemious regular courſe of life, which religioniſts oft preſcribe to themſelves, naturally creating ſuch a temperature of the vital frame in general, and the animal ſpirits, of which we have been ſpeaking, in particular, the ſoul in that caſe becomes, as it were, almoſt wholly intellectual, and in proportion to the *actual* purity and piety of its *affections*, more than *human*;—when not perverted, I mean, by falſe doctrines, into a glaring *miſapprehenſion* of the divine attributes. When *that* is the caſe, which is too frequently the conſequence of a zeal without knowledge, the ſoul, by means of the ſame kind of tenuity and pliability (if I may ſo ſpeak) of the animal ſpirits, will be as naturally carried into an intenſe melancholly.

If then a due temperature and purity of the animal frame, is found neceſſary to enable the ſoul to exert her intellectual *powers* and *affections*, with an added freedom, independency, and vigour, what muſt then be the conſequence of a reverſe ſtate? when the blood and ſpirits are defecated by fumes or foul ſecretions from a ſtomach, replete with groſs, or high-ſeaſoned food, and *rich* wines, &c. neither parts, purity, nor piety can take place; imagination cannot ſpeed its courſe through ſo foul and corrupt an atmoſphere; pure deſires are overwhelmed by incentives to looſe and unchaſte gratifications; reaſon is dethroned, by the inroad of an army of fleſhly

luſts;

that time, the big dropping tear abundantly witneſſed? Doſt thou, again, remember by whom thou wert

---

luſts; and the whole man becomes at once totally carnal, ſenſual, deviliſh. How wiſely, therefore, is faſting and abſtinence uſually directed to accompany acts of public *humiliation?* and with what propriety does the apoſtle caution us againſt making proviſion for the fleſh, to fulfil the luſts thereof; which a man cannot do more fatally, than, when running into that, too common vice, *ebriety*. Thoſe immediate inſtruments of thought, *reaſon*, and reflection, the animal ſpirits, being abſorded, as it were, in the fumes diſtilled from the intoxicating juice, the *man* falls a victim to every irregular, ſenſual and ſinful appetite. A variety of follies, indiſcretions, and even vile enormities, are the too frequent attendants. His eyes ſhall behold ſtrange women, and his heart ſhall utter perverſe things. Fornication, adultry, murder, are the reſult of this vice daily; and how frequently is that truly-valuable and endearing quality in man, friendſhip, ſwallowed up in it? A ſudden dilatation of the heart enſues, that oft times betrays a man into a diſcloſure of ſecrets of the greateſt conſequence, perhaps, and repoſed in him with the utmoſt confidence. Nor can he, in that ſituation, be even faithful to himſelf. In the ſudden guſts of paſſion, too naturally iſſuing from a diſtempered brain, *ſtifled* enmities, and *lurking* malevolences, all the inward emotions of envy, hatred, malice, and a multitude of deep-laid devices, ſo induſtriouſly concealed before, break from him. And this ſerves to ſhew how much we are miſtaken, in imagining, when a man's temper ſeems altered by the effects of the circulating glaſs, that there is a *creation*, as if were, of ſome *new* paſſion, ſome new-formed diſtemper of the mind? No. The latent *workings* of a miſchievous, malevolent, rancorous heart, aſſume a *confidence*, to which *reaſon*, when not abſorbed by the fumes of liquor, was a ſufficient check before; and the man unwittingly *ſhews* himſelf now, in his native, naked, worthleſſneſs. Agreeably to which, ſays Plutarch, το εν τη καρδια τε πηΦοντος επι της γλωσσης εςι μεθυοντος. i. e.

The man *ſpeaks*, when he is drunk, what he dares only *think* when he is ſober.

And again, ſays the Epigram on Ebriety,

Αει Θηριον ηθα Πελυκριτε νυν δε πεπωκως
Εξαπινης εγενε λυσσαμενες τι κακον.
Αει μοι δοκεις κακος εμμεναι: Οινος ελεγχει
Τον τροπον, Ουκ εγενε νυν κακος αλλ, εΦανης.

It was not the wine that *made* the bad man, but it was the bad man that *ſhewed* himſelf in the wine.

Not

wert wrapped in ſwadling clothes, or by whom rocked from time to time in thy cradle? Who mixed for thee the milky pap, and ſupplied thee with thy daily ſuſtenance? Or were not in reality theſe things ſo? Alas! They might, or they might not, for any proofs thou canſt bring of either, from thine own preſent conſciouſneſs.

When the miniſter at the font ſprinkled thee with the water of baptiſm, and thou wert engrafted into the body of Chriſt's church, when three or four around him gave ſecurity for thy *leading a godly and a Chriſtian life*, and all joined in devout prayers to the almighty for the ſame, remembreſt thou, I pray, aught of this?

§ 4. When thy maturer ſtrength enabled thee to ſpring from the cradle, and from thy nurſe's arms, and thou waddleſt with eager pace from chair to chair, remembreſt thou who was the ſedulous attendant on thy feeble frame, and who kept from time to time thy feet from falling? And when thy tongue denied thee an utterance

---

Not that I would mean to appear ſo ſevere and dry a Cynic, with reſpect to this point, as if I had a mind to diſcountenance wholly the cheerful glaſs. Taken in moderation, it is not only ſalutary oft times to the body, but productive, at the ſame time, of a kind of invigorating, enlivening, dilatation and activity in the ſoul. The miſchief of it lies in an exceſs; as ſays the Greek moraliſt,

Οινον τοι πινειν πθλυν κακον. Ην δε τις αυτον
Πινη επιςταμενως, ε κακος αλλ, αγαθος.
Οσογ: ſνωμαι —Lin. 210, 211.

Wine circulating with exceſs is bad,
But makes man's heart, when drank with temp'rance, glad.

The author begs the *reader*'s pardon for this long digreſſion, and hopes he will frame the beſt excuſe for it he can.

of

of what thou didſt not more wiſh to ſpeak, than thoſe about thee to hear, what was the pleaſing object of thy fancy *then?*

When afterwards thy tongue was looſed, and thou delightedſt thy fond parents with inceſſant prattle, doeſt thou remember the hundredth part of the pretty things thou ſaidſt—being a *witty child*—with what mirth thou regaledſt the admiring gueſt, and with what an heart-felt joy thy doating mother catched the whiſpered applauſe of thy growing genius?

§ 5. Where, again, is thy *conſciouſneſs* of a long train of events, and a variety of detached circumſtances in thy more ripened life, when memory got firm hold on thee? Thy gibes too, thy gambols, thy ſongs, and thy flaſhes of meriment (beſides thy ten thouſand freaks, which died in thinking) how few of them are there, which have not paſſed off from thy remembrance like the dew of morn, or like " the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion, " leaving not a wreck behind."

§ 6. If then it appears that the ſoul does exiſt in *ſome* periods of life, without retaining in other ſubſequent ſtages of her exiſtence, a conſciouſneſs of ſuch exiſtence, why may it not in *others?* In deliria, ebriety, ſleep, &c. it apparently does. With reſpect to the two firſt, the fact is ſo notorious, that it would be an abſurdity even to ſuppoſe it a matter of doubt with any one. And if in proof of the latter I again branch out into a long digreſſive note, I muſt again beſpeak the reader's candor *.

§ 7. That

---

* It is altogether as intelligible, to ſay, that a body is extended without parts, ſays Mr. Locke, as that any thing thinks, without being conſcious of it. Hum. Und. v. 1. p. 77. That there muſt be a conſciouſneſs of what paſſes in a man's

§ 7. That there are ſome ſtages of exiſtence therefore, through which the ſoul does actually paſs,

---

man's mind during the very *time* of thinking, it may, perhaps, be granted; but that ſuch a train of thinking muſt neceſſarily be followed by an *after-recollection* of the ſubject-matter of the thought, we have proofs to the contrary from men's *dreams*. For there are frequent inſtances of perſon's talking, and ſhewing other ſigns of thinking, in their ſleep; of which, when awakened, they have remembered nothing. And, it is notorious, that many a dream is *awakened* in a man's mind, by the accidental occurrence of ſome ſimilar or relative circumſtances, without which, the man would not have *known* that he had dreamed that night at all. Mr. Locke, in ſhort, either deſignedly quibbles, or miſtakenly blunders here moſt egregiouſly, in not making the due diſtinction between *preſent* conſciouſneſs (i. e. a conſciouſneſs of what paſſes in the mind during the *time* of thinking) and an *after recollection* of a man's thoughts. And it gives me great concern, to ſee ſo great a man dealing out ſophiſtry, inſtead of ſolid argument, ſo plentifully, in ſupport of a favourite hypotheſis; which he does moſt remarkably in his 12th, and ſome following ſections of the chapter above quoted. In fact, I cannot help imagining, that the ſoul is, for the moſt part, equally employed in thought, ſleeping as well as waking, with this difference only, that it is, and muſt be, in the former ſtate, exerciſed in ſpeculating *internal* objects only.—I mean images *ſenſitive*, or *intellectual*, internally impreſſed on the ſenſorium *before*—whereas, waking, it has the power of taking in other external objects alſo. All the avenues for a freſh ſupply of *external* objects being ſhut up in ſleep, the mind can only employ itſelf in the contemplation of ſuch as are within, with the ſeveral detached impreſſes conveyed to the brain, by the inſtrumentality of the outward organs of ſenſe when awake. By which means the ſoul has ſuch an *imaginary* ſenſe of things, as muſt neceſſarily appear real, till ſhewn to be otherwiſe, by external demonſtrations from the awakened organs of ſenſe and reflection. Hence it is, that the *dead* are ſo frequently made to live again in the *imagination*, that *paſt* converſations become *preſent*, and that we are made to act, as it were, a redoubled and repeated life. Hence it is, that things improbable, and even things impoſſible, appear, in a manner, *real*—that yon cobler in his ſtall ſhall be a king in his bed, and the enamoured Damon in the *preſence* of his lovely Philis, at an hundred miles diſtance from her. The dream-

ing

paſs, without deriving to itſelf any reflex conſciouſneſs

ing imagination, in ſhort, makes reaſon to entertain the fond idea, of which the *awakened* mind only diſcovers the illuſion. What the *line* and *rule* are to the maſon, or other mechanic, the organic powers of the body are to the mind. The former give the workmen an *experimental* knowledge of what, *without* them, they would only have an *ideal* or *conjectural*, and that moſt frequently, and of conſequence, an erroneous one. In like manner, the *experience* ariſing to the mind, from time to time, by the inſtrumentality of the *waking* organs of ſenſe, is that *rule* of right, by which we are enabled to diſtinguiſh *real* exiſtences from imaginary ones. It is not to be wondered, therefore, if, when the ſoul lies drowned, as it were, in the *deep* of ſleep, that the various detached *ideas* of kings, coblers, friends, foes, ſports, paſtimes, frolicks, follies, pains, pleaſures, horſes, towns, harbours, mountains, rivers, &c. &c. floating upon the ſurface of the imagination, ſeparately attract, at times, the ſoul's attention. The *images* of things being *preſent* to the mind, the *man* himſelf ſeems, for the time, *preſent* too. The *perceptions* of the impreſſions made, when awake, on the ſenſorium, are as real as if the *objects* really exiſted; the ſoul takes them for *real*, it acts and behaves as if they were real. So that a man may be a monarch in his ſleep, to all intents and purpoſes *(a) excepting* only that the *experience of ſenſe*, when he is awake, convinces him that he is not—not *really*, though he was *ideally* ſo before. He then *ſees* and *hears* that he is no monarch; the avenues to which ſenſible demonſtrations were ſhut, or locked up, before, in ſleep (*b*).

(*a*) το γαρ ως υπαρ ειδεν ονειρον. Moſch.

(*b*) A very ingenious writer reſolves the phenomenon of dreams into the agency of *ſeparate ſpirits*; but in this, though in other reſpects a moſt engaging writer and ſolid reaſoner, he is moſt egregiouſly miſtaken. Vid. The Enquiry into the Nat. of the Human Soul.

That thoſe various prophetic, &c, dreams among the people of old, and of whom ſcripture makes mention, were infuſed by the agency of ſeparate ſpirits, and that ſomewhat of a ſimilar nature, and from a ſimilar cauſe, may have been not unfrequently experienced by numbers in life ſince, we have abundant reaſons to conclude. But what I contend for is, that thoſe incoherent, extravagant, &c, dreams, with which the mind is ſo often and uſually buſied in ſleep, are not as I apprehend effected by the agency of ſeparate ſpirits but created as above mentioned.

ouſneſs of ſuch prior exiſtences, viz. from its *firſt* formation to its deſcent into the womb, and its exit therefrom, in its infant ſtate *always*, and oft times in deliria, ebriety, ſleep, experience proves inconteſtably; and though the *non-conſciouſneſs* of tranſactions paſt, in a ſuppoſed prior ſtate, cannot affect the credibility of the ſoul's having paſſed through ſuch a ſtate, without rendering equally diſputable its *vital* exiſtence in the womb, in deliria, ebriety, ſleep, or the like; yet to ſet the *inſufficiency* of the objection to the doctrine of pre-exiſtence, grounded on the want of *conſciouſneſs*, in a far ſtronger light ſtill, the reader is requeſted to take into conſideration a circumſtance, hitherto ſcarce enough, if at all attended to, which is this, viz. ſuppoſing a *prior* exiſtence ever ſo unqueſtionable, and even demonſtrable, yet it is not in the nature of things *poſſible*, that there ſhould be a recollection of things tranſacted in that ſtate. In the firſt place—

§ 8. Unleſs the ſoul had brought with it upon *this* ſtage of action, the ſame kind of vehicle wherein it was encloſed in the *former*, how is it poſſible it ſhould have any *re-conception* of thoſe ideas of which *that* ſort of body only was furniſhed with proper inſtruments for the formation and reception? The ſoul in its former ſtate was converſant, we may ſuppoſe, only with objects immaterial; the preſent furniſhes it with ſuch as are *material* only, i. e. the latter are the only objects of which the ſoul's preſent vehicle can derive to the mind any poſitive diſtinct images and repreſentations.

Is it wonderful then that the former ſhould be defaced and diſpoſſeſſed by the latter? Or rather, does it ſeem poſſible, that objects *immaterial* ſhould be let in upon, or any *former* images thereof be renewed, in the mind, through organs ſuited to the reception of *material* images only.

§ 9. The ſoul cannot now reflect upon, ſo as to form, I mean, ideas of any thing ſpiritual or immaterial, not even of its own nature and eſſence —and wherefore? Why, becauſe it is itſelf of a ſubſtance immaterial; and the body, by the inſtrumentality of which the ideas of objects are reflected and refracted to the mind, is not adapted to reflect to its view an object ſo refined and imperceptible to preſent ſenſe *. Agreeably to

---

* In anſwer to which it will be urged, perhaps, that the *nature* of a *ſpirit*, or of objects immaterial, is not leſs *conceivable* or eaſy to be defined than the nature of any thing elſe. For as for the very *eſſence* or bare *ſubſtance* of any thing whatſoever, he is a very novice in ſpeculation that does not acknowledge, *that* utterly *unknowable*; but as for the *eſſential* and inſeparable properties, they are as intelligible and explicable in a ſpirit as in any other ſubject whatſoever. Vid. Dr. More's Antidot. b. 1. c. 4.

That the *nature* and bare *eſſence* of matter and ſpirit is alike *unknowable* and unexplicable I will not take upon me to deny; but, will it therefore follow, that the exiſtence of each is equally *diſcernable* and *ſenſible?* Material objects act upon our ſenſes, ſo as to become actually palpable. But can this be ſaid of objects immaterial? Can the exiſtence of things, not the objects of *ſenſe*, which make not impreſſions on the mind, I mean, by the inſtrumentality of the organs of either hearing, ſeeing, the taſte or the touch, &c. be ſaid to be equally obvious, knowable and *diſcernable* as thoſe which exiſt only in the *imagination*, i. e. of whoſe exiſtence the imagination is confirmed *ſolely* by the deductions of reaſon and revelation? And yet, ſuch is the caſe with pure *immateriality*, which is not capable of being manifeſted to any of our bodily ſenſes; is of a *nature* ſimilar to thoſe exiſtences alluded to in Scripture, which eye hath not ſeen, nor *can* ſee *here*; nor ear heard, nor which have entered into the heart of man to conceive, but are perceivable by the eye of the *underſtanding* only.

As for Dr. Berkley's hypotheſis, upon which he attempts to reaſon men out of their *ſenſes*, and to *diſprove* the actual *exiſtence* of what they hear, ſee, ſmell, taſte, or feel. (Vid. Dr. Berkley's Principles of Human Knowledge) I cannot, I own, think it *material* enough to require any notice here, or even any where.

which,

which, ſays Mr. Wolaſton,—the ſoul may contemplate the body which it inhabits, be conſcious of its own acts, and reflect upon the ideas it finds; but of its own ſubſtance it can have no adequate notion, unleſs it could be, as it were, object and ſpectator. And again, ſays another writer *: The ſubtle matter which goes out of the body with the ſoul, is indeed too fine to ſtrike upon our groſſer ſenſes, but we may ſee it when God aſſiſts us in an extraordinary manner. By the *ſubtle matter* here mentioned, is meant, that inward vehicle in which Plato, Ariſtotle, Des-Cartes, and our great Dr. More, ſuppoſe the ſoul to act ſeparately from that outward one, the body†, by the inſtrumentality of which it exerts its efformative or plaſtic powers, for ſuch an organization of its outward vehicle, as ſhall be neceſſary for the diſcharge of its vital function in ſuch vehicle, be it an etherial, aerial, or a terreſtrial one.

§ 10. Now agreeably to the opinion of the Platoniſts, and other philoſophers, I ſuppoſe the ſoul to have paſſed through the two *former* of the above-mentioned vehicles, previous to its entrance into *this*‡: from whence another argument ariſes, which equally (or rather, more powerfully) demonſtrates how impoſſible it is, that there ſhould

---

* Mr. Poiret, in Mr. Bayle's Life of Rorarius.

† Ariſtotle plainly affirms, that the ſoul partakes of a body diſtinct from this organized terreſtrial body, conſiſting of a nature etherial and lucid, and analogous to the element of the ſtars. φυσις αναλογος υσα τω των αστρων στοχειω. Vid. M. Im. b. 2. c. 14. p. 118.

‡ Should the ſoul have been reduced to a ſtate of *ſilence* and *inactivity*, " before its turn came to revive in an earthly " body," as Dr. More, though with no degree of probability, I think, ſuppoſes. (Vid. Immor. b. 2. c. 14. p. 119.) ſuch a ſuppoſition, ſhould it be admitted for truth, will account for an *oblivion* of what happened to it in a *preceding* exiſtence.

be a re-conception of things tranſacted in a prior ſtate, was our exiſtence therein ever ſo unqueſtionable.

§ 11. For, ſecondly, each *outward* vehicle of the ſoul, being the tablet whereon are impreſſed and treaſured up the images of objects conveyed thither through the organs of *that* vehicle, and reflected to the ſoul from time to time, by the *inſtrumentality* of the *inward* vehicle above-mentioned, all *prior* images and impreſſions muſt, of courſe, be *dead* to the ſoul, when it changes that outward vehicle for another. And though it is, methinks, eaſy and reaſonable to imagine, that the regiſtry of facts contained in one vehicle, may be tranſmitted progreſſively and *upward*, to another, that the ſoul in each ſtage of its return thither, from whence it came, may, by means of that nearer approach to the ſource and center of perception, intuition and *reflection*, acquire a reconceptive intimation of *many* tranſactions paſt, yet its deſcent *downwards* into this beſmearing moiſture of the firſt rudiments of life, as Dr. More expreſſes it, muſt, of courſe, lull it into an oblivion of whatever happened to it in its former abodes; nor will the *whole ſcene* of paſt tranſactions, in each ſucceſſive ſtage hither, be exhibited, perhaps, till the day wherein *the books ſhall be opened, and the dead judged, out of thoſe things that are written in the book, according to their works.* Apoc. c. 20.

§ 12. This however is certain, that whatever were the objects (material or immaterial) with which we had been converſant in a prior ſtate, yet the difference of organs, ariſing from different vehicles, muſt render it *impoſſible* for any thing here to recall to the mind images paſt; the preſent vehicle being, toto cœlo, ſo diſſimilar from

from the former, and ſuited to the reception of *terreſtrial* images only.

§ 13. You ſee, then, of what little avail the ſoul's *non-conſciouſneſs* of tranſactions paſt is, towards rendering incredible its ſuppoſed exiſtence in a prior ſtate; or rather, how impoſſible it is, ſuppoſing ſuch an exiſtence demonſtrable, that there ſhould be tranſmitted to the ſoul, in this its third vehicle, a conſciouſneſs of what paſſed in the firſt.

§ 14. OBJ. II. It will, however, in the next place, be urged, that if we are here under a judicial degradation for crimes committed above, are probationers for a recovery of the divine favour, forfeited by ſuch treſpaſſes, it is inconceivable how, without being conſcious of either the guilt or chaſtiſement therein implied, we can be brought to ſuch a repentant ſtate of mind, as muſt be neceſſary for the obtaining the wiſhed-for reconciliation, with our offended God.

§ 15. In anſwer to this objection, I would, in the firſt place, aſk, where lies the fault, if men are really ſo much in the dark, with reſpect to *theſe* points, as the objection ſuppoſes? Would they but give a fair, unprejudiced ear to the voice of reaſon, ſcripture, and the moſt learned, ingenious, and religious of almoſt every age, I do not ſee how it is poſſible they can be under any kind of doubt about either.

§ 16. I have already conſidered a pre-exiſtence of human ſouls, not only as the belief of moſt of the learned, in all ages paſt, but as the very ground-work of the goſpel diſpenſation.

The former has been ſufficiently evinced in a foregoing chapter; nor could the latter be leſs obvious to the Chriſtian world in general, would men be perſuaded to throw aſide their prejudices, give

give the ſcriptures a fair and rational *interpretation*, and aim to makeChriſtianity coincide with the nature and attributes of God, its divine Author. Evidences, without number, of a depraved degenerate nature in man, his own condemning heart ſets in continual array before him; that this cannot be the work either of God or our primogenitor Adam, reaſon proves inconteſtibly; that we are children of wrath from our birth, and under the power and dominion of Satan, in our *natural unregenerate ſtate*, ariſing from a prior aſſociation with the apoſtate angels, and that to purify our corrupted nature, to expiate our original guilt, and to reſcue us from the powers of darkneſs, is the very end and deſign of the goſpel diſpenſation, we have full ſufficient evidence, from reaſon, ſcripture, and the expreſs fundamental articles of the Chriſtian faith; or, I know not, what is the true language of ſcripture, what ideas we are to affix to the terms *redemption*, *atonement*, &c*. nor what we are to underſtand

* Dr. Taylor, indeed, obſerves as follows: "The ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, excepting Rom. xii. &c. and 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. before explained, do always aſſign the *actual wickedneſs and corruption of mankind, wherewith they have corrupted themſelves*, as a reaſon and ground (next to the grace of God) of Chriſt's coming into the world. When the apoſtle, Rom. i. 16, 17. is profeſſedly demonſtrating the excellency and neceſſity of goſpel grace (which is the ſame thing as the redemption in Chriſt) for the ſalvation of the world, he proves it, not from the ſtate of ſin and miſery, into which they were brought by Adam's fall, but from the ſin and miſery which they had brought upon themſelves by their *own wicked departing from God* — ver. 21. Becauſe, that when they knew God, they glorified him, not as God, but became vain in their imaginations, and their fooliſh hearts were darkened. And ſo on to the end of the chapter.

"And

ſtand by St. Paul's being ſent to open the eyes of the Gentiles; to turn them from darkneſs to light, and

---

" And as the Gentiles, ſo likewiſe, the Jews had corrupted themſelves and ſtood in need of goſpel grace, and redemption, as well as other men, Chap. ii. iii. to ver. 19. where he concludes, he had, from notorious facts and ſcripture-proofs, ſtopped every mouth, both of Jew and Gentile, and brought in the *whole world guilty before God*, and inſufficient for their own juſtification upon the deeds of mere law. And then goes on—but *now the righteouſneſs of God*, or that method of ſalvation which the gracious law-giver hath provided, *is manifeſted* to the world, &c. for the benefit of all ſorts of men (Ver 23. For all ſtand in need of it, all having ſinned and come ſhort of the glory of God, i. e. the obedience of God) that they may be juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Chriſt, &c. You ſee the apoſtle grounds the grace of redemption upon the actual wickedneſs of mankind, and upon no other cauſe or reaſon. So Tit. iii. 3. For we ourſelves alſo were ſometimes fooliſh, &c. Ver. 4. But after that the kindneſs and love of God, our Saviour, towards man, appeared,—Ver. 5. According to his mercy he ſaved us, &c.—Ver. 6. Which he hath ſhed on us, &c. Ver. 7. That being juſtified by his grace we ſhould be made heirs, &c. Gal. i. 4. He gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from this preſent evil world. i. e. from the luſts of the fleſh. 1 Pet. i. 18. We are redeemed from a vain converſation. 1 John iii. 8. For this purpoſe the Son of God was manifeſted, that he might deſtroy the works of the devil. In ſhort (excepting the two places above excepted, which relate only to the reverſing the ſentence of common mortality) I know not of any place in ſcripture where redemption is not aſſigned on God's part, to his own free grace; and on man's part to the depravity and corruption of the world, wherewith they have depraved themſelves. And I verily believe it is not in the power of any man to bring any text to the contrary. Vid. Dr. Taylor on Original Sin, Part 3. p. 290".

The deſign of our Saviour's coming into the world, therefore, according to Dr. Taylor's opinion, was not to redeem mankind from the guilt and puniſhment of any corruption *of nature*, inherent or derived, but to atone for their actual *perſonal* treſpaſſes, or (as he expreſſes it) *their own wicked departing*

and from the *power of Satan* unto God. And that the ſtate of the Gentile world is to be conſidered as

---

ing from God—both Jew and Gentile *had corrupted themſelves*; and ſtood equally in need of goſpel grace and redemption, all having ſinned and come ſhort of the glory of God. But how ſinned? By any derived, imputed guilt from Adam? No, ſays Dr. Taylor; and with great truth, I believe. But they ſinned, ſays he, by *their* wicked departing from God; by *their* own actual, *perſonal* wickedneſs; and on *this*, and no *other* cauſe or reaſon whatſoever, is grounded the grace of redemption. But this wicked departing from God, this *perſonal* wickedneſs, &c. whence proceed that? What could urge creatures, living under ſo ſtrong a ſenſe of the nature and attributes of the divine Being, and of their manifold obligations to him, to requite his inexhauſted goodneſs with ſuch repeated acts of impiety, ingratitude, and vile enormities? What, but a *heart* elapſed from original righteouſneſs, eſtranged from God and goodneſs, and devoted wholly to the ſervice of the prince of darkneſs? A releaſe, therefore, from the original *guilt*, deſerved puniſhment, and growing *power* of this malady (and not as Dr. Taylor ſuppoſes from the ſeveral ſpecies of vice which could not *but* flow therefrom) is the whole and ſole object of the redemption by Jeſus Chriſt. This is plainly intimated, by the apoſtle to the Romans, c. v. and x. *For when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.*—When we were enemies——i. e. when we were in a ſtate of *enmity* with God, *children of wrath*, (as we all were by *nature*, on account of that ſtate of ſin and iniquity in which we were born, and thoſe corruptions of nature which attended us from the womb) we were reconciled to God, were reſcued from the power and puniſhment of thoſe corruptions, &c. by the death of Chriſt. And the ſinners to which the apoſtle here alludes, as reconciled to God, and of courſe cleanſed from their ſins, are not to be conſidered as ſinners, made ſuch by *perſonal* treſpaſſes *here*, but by that *original* debaſement of nature, in which they were conceived. For, in the firſt ſenſe, even the regenerate and converted, were repreſented as ſinners ſtill. *If we ſay we have no ſin*, ſays St. John, *we deceive ourſelves, and the truth is not in us.* 1 John i. 8. But ſins, conſidered in the other ſenſe, the ſins which were the immediate objects of redemption, they are forgiven us; are, as the apoſtle ſpeaks, nailed to the croſs. *The body of ſin is deſtroyed. Sin*

ſhall

as the *natural* ſtate of men, ſeems evident from the following paſſage, of St. Paul to the Epheſians. *And* you *hath he quickened, who were dead in treſpaſſes and ſins. Wherein, in time paſt, ye walked accoraing to the courſe of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the ſpirit that now worketh in the children of diſobedience. Among whom alſo we all had our converſation in times paſt in the luſts of our fleſh, fulfilling the deſires of the fleſh and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.* Intimating, that the apoſtle and his Chriſtian converts were, before their converſion, upon the ſame footing entirely with the Gentile world, walked as they did, according to

---

ſhall not now have dominion over us. *For we are not under the law, but under grace.*

But, ſays Dr. Taylor, " the redeemer himſelf frequently ſpeaks of various parts of his own great work; ſuch as, enlivening the world, converting-ſinners, raiſing the dead, &c. but of redeeming it from the ſinfulneſs and corruption of nature *derived from Adam,* he ſaith not one word in all the four goſpels."

I muſt, however, beg leave here to obſerve, that our Saviour's ſilence, with reſpect to this or any other ſuppoſed ſcripture-doctrine, is not to be conſidered abſolutely as a kind of impeachment of its credibility and importance; it being evident, that the myſtery of godlineſs was not wholly revealed, but in part (and on *purpoſe*) concealed by our Saviour, from even his own diſciples. I have many things (ſays our Saviour, to his diſciples, juſt before his departure from them) *I have many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now:* But the time cometh (ſays he afterward) that I ſhall no more ſpeak unto you in proverbs, but I ſhall ſhew you plainly of the Father, viz. by the Spirit of truth, which he promiſed to ſend unto them, and which was gradually to unfold to the world the great myſtery of the redemption by Chriſt; a great part of which remains to this day, if not totally, concealed, at the beſt but obſcurely revealed, which is notoriouſly the caſe with reſpect to St. John's Revelation, *that* is undoubtedly a repoſitory of important truths as yet *unrevealed,* ſo far I mean as not to be *univerſally* if at all underſtood.

the courſe of this world, and of him who is the head of that aerial kingdom, and of the ſpirit which now works in the children of diſobedience; (Vid. Eſtium in Loc.) that they were led aſtray, not by the impetuouſity of their *carnal* diſpoſitions only, but by the depravity των διανοιων of their mental *affections*, their *minds* alſo; and were *therefore*, on that account, and by *nature*, the *children of wrath*, like as others*.

§ 16. And, that the church of England conſiders now the natural *unregenerated* ſtate of man entirely in the ſame light, we have ample evidence, not only from her articles and homilies but from the introduction to the form of infant baptiſm, and in her church catechiſm. For, what is the prieſt's declaration in the introduction to the form of baptiſm? Is it not, dearly beloved, foraſmuch as all men are *conceived* and *born in ſin*, and that our Saviour Chriſt ſaith, none can enter into the kingdom of heaven except he be regenerate, and born a-new, of water and the Holy Ghoſt? And does he not beſeech the congregation to call upon God, to grant to *that* child, to be baptized, that thing which by *nature* he cannot have? And is not his firſt prayer to God, for

---

* Dr. Taylor, however ſays, p. 110, 111, &c. "Far was it from the apoſtle's thoughts, to ſuggeſt any thing tending to depreciate our nature. His true intent was, to convince the Epheſians they were children of wrath through the treſpaſſes and ſins in which they had *walked*. For he is not ſpeaking of their nature, or the conſtitution of their ſouls and bodies, as they came into the world; but, evidently, of the vicious courſe of life they had led among the Gentiles." But to ſhew how fallacious the declaration is, I would aſk *what* and from *whence* were thoſe *principles* which *led* to that vicious courſe of life. Were *they* not bad? And could *they* proceed from any thing leſs than an *inherent* depravity of nature?

his

his *infinite mercies*, that he would *mercifully* look upon that *child*; that he would *waſh* him and *ſanctify* him with the Holy Ghoſt, that he might be *delivered from his wrath* (even before he could ſpeak, or diſcern good or evil) and received into the ark of Chriſt's church? And upon what elſe, but a preſumption of the efficacy of baptiſm to reſtore the *infant* from the puniſhment of original ſin, does the prieſt ground his aſſurance, and give the ſame hope to the ſponſors, that God will receive that *preſent* infant, that he will embrace him with the *arms of his mercy*, will give unto him the bleſſing of eternal life, and make him partaker of his everlaſting kingdom? And what anſwer does our church catechiſm give to the queſtion—What is the inward and ſpiritual grace? Is it not—A death unto ſin, and a new birth unto righteouſneſs, for being *by nature born in ſin and children of wrath*, we are hereby made the CHILDREN OF GRACE?

§ 17. That our church cannot *reaſonably* be underſtood to reſolve this inherent delinquency in our nature to an *imputed guilt* from Adam, I have already ſhewn in my comment on her ninth article. And have proved from ſcripture and the nature and tenor of the goſpel diſpenſation, that men are from their birth, and in their *natural unregenerate* ſtate, children of wrath, and under the power and dominion of Satan; and if, from what has already been ſaid upon this point, this complex calamity in man ſhould appear to be the reſult of a prior aſſociation with the apoſtate powers, ſhall the want of a *conſciouſneſs* of the ſeveral *circumſtances* of the ſuppoſed *lapſe*, which, in the nature of things is

not, as I have ſhewn above *poſſible*, be deemed a ſufficient warrant for the *diſbelief* of the hypotheſis, in oppoſition to ſcripture, reaſon, and the opinion of the moſt rational and approved writers, Heathen, Jewiſh, and Chriſtian philoſophers, &c?

§ 18. And reader, as I doubt not of your having diſcernment enough to conceive rightly the force of an argument, let me aſk you this queſtion. Have any of us, any *other conſciouſneſs* of *our* being the *offspring of heaven*, and candidates for a future immortality, than what ariſes from the ſame kind of information? — Is, in ſhort, any *ſtronger* evidence appealed to, or even required, in proof of a God, the immortality of the ſoul, or of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments? And if that original guilt charged upon us in ſcripture, is, in reality derived from our *firſt parents*, how comes it to paſs, that there are millions in the world, who, ſo far from having a *conſciouſneſs* of ſuch *ſuppoſed* truth in their minds, treat, on the contrary, with the utmoſt deriſion and deteſtation, the *extraordinary* doctrine?

§ 19. And then, *ſecondly*; that a *conſciouſneſs* of paſt tranſactions is not eſſentially neceſſary for the reformation of a being degraded for ſuch tranſactions, as the above objection ſuppoſes, the caſe of Nebuchadnezzar (not to mention any other argument at preſent) clearly evinces. What *conſciouſneſs* had he of that wretched condition to which he was reduced, or the crimes from which it reſulted, when, as ſcripture informs us, he *was driven from men, and did eat graſs as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown like eagles feathers, and his nails like birds claws? At the end of the days*, indeed when his ſeven

ſeven years degradation was at an end, he lifted up his eyes unto heaven, and his underſtanding returned unto him, and he bleſſed the moſt High, and praiſed and honoured Him that liveth for ever.

§ 20. Now, whether there was, or was not, an actual transformation of the monarch into the form of a beaſt, it is not eſſential to the point in queſtion to determine; it being ſufficient to obſerve, that his *heart*, or the ſtate of his *mind*, was *changed* from *man*'s heart, and a *beaſt's heart* was given him*; and without any apparent *conſciouſneſs* of

---

* This *transfiguration* of Nebuchadnazar, for *former crimes*, ſeems intended to ſhadow out to us the nature and circumſtances of the brute creation?

That brutes are endowed with ſome degree of reaſon and reflection, and a ſenſibility of pain, as well as pleaſure, there is no kind of doubt with men of reaſon and reflection. Nor is it leſs evident and unqueſtionable that the latter, viz, Pain, is frequently more than overbalanced by the former. To mention only that excellent and moſt ſerviceable animal, the horſe: What exquiſite, what affecting tortures do many of theſe animals endure (though ſome few of them, perhaps, meet with a more friendly fate) from ſome mercileſs, callous-hearted monſter of a maſter! How frequently, to the pangs of hunger and a diſtempered body, are added the moſt cutting ſtripes and ſcourges, moſt liberally, and oftimes wantonly, dealt out by an inhuman driver, or ſome human brute, a rider! And all this, perhaps, for not effecting impoſſibilities!

But wherefore all this wretchedneſs? Wherefore all theſe agonizing pains and miſeries heaped on an helpleſs offſpring of divine providence? Are they not fleſh and blood? Do *they* not, as well as *we*, know what ſorrow means? Were *they* brought into a ſenſible exiſtence for nothing but the ſervice, or rather to gratify the pride, the wantonneſs, the cruelty of man? Shall one being be created, even under the bare poſſibility of being made miſerable, ſolely for the uſe or pleaſure

of either his degradation, or the guilt for which it was the deſtined puniſhment, a proper remorſe for his former pride, vanity, and ſelf-ſuffici-

---

pleaſure of another? Lord, what is man? or, rather, what are not brutes? Are *they* not, let me aſk, ſouls, labouring under a ſeverer ſtroke of juſtice, than is the lot of man, from having contracted an heavier load of pre-exiſtent guilt? What can be more probable? what more adequate to our idea of infinite rectitude? If it ſhould be urged, that the aſſigning ſouls to one part of the brute creation, will reduce us to the neceſſity of ſuppoſing the *like* to actuate the moſt minute ſpecies of vital nature alſo; I would wiſh the ſpeculative and philoſophic part of mankind, to conſider that there is diſcernable, by the microſcopic eye, as exquiſitely juſt and due proportioned diſpoſition of organs, fibres, &c, (the more amazing, in proportion as they are more minute) in the one as in the other.—That, again the ſoul has the power of ſelf-contraction to an infiniteſſimal degree, as well as that of ſelf dilatation—that, ſuppoſing, in the next place, every organized body, as well in the brute creation, as in the rational, to be an allotted *temporary* priſon for a *predelinquent* ſoul (an hypotheſis, than which, there cannot, I think be one more rational) it is eaſy to conceive how, and why, *ſome* may be made priſoners here more at large, as we ſay, and entruſted with privileges and faculties more numerous, extenſive, and exalted than others: and that, laſtly, it is impoſſible to ſay into how many different kinds of vehicles a ſoul may tranſmigrate, 'ere its *plaſtic faculty* be refined enough to inform one wherein to perform the functions of an *intelligent* and rational life *(a)*.

(a) But St. Cyprian's obſervation upon the point is methinks no bad one.

Should I deny, ſays he, that flies, beetles, wood-lice, glow-worms, mites, moths, are the work of the Almighty, it will not neceſſarily be required of me to ſay who made them, who appointed them. I may without offence, ſurely, ſay that I know not from whence they came.

Si negemus muſcas, ſcarabæos, & cimices, nitedulas, curculiones, et tineas omnipotentis eſſe opus regis, non ſequi-

tur

ſufficiency, was the happy conſequence. There is, however, no reaſon to doubt but that *a retroſpective ſcene* of paſt tranſactions, will hereafter, in conſequence of a pre-concerted plan, worthy a God of infinite wiſdom and juſtice, be laid open to all thoſe who have travelled through this vale of miſery, *irreminiſcent* of the country from which they *came*, which will be productive of every deſirable advantage.

§ 21. OBJEC. III. But ſtill ſay you, when I paſs through the ſtreets of this great metropolis, or travel into different countries, what multitudes of the human race appear with a complacency of countenance which ſo far from teſtifying any inward conſciouſneſs of a *prior* guilt, forbids our entertaining the leaſt ſuſpicion of their being chargeable with any thing of that kind! And, ſhould it be told them, that they had not only lived in a prior ſtate, but were detruded into this lower world, as a kind of diſinherited offspring of heaven, and adherents to the prince of darkneſs; how few are there who would not fire with indignation at the horrid report? When, again, we view the anointed of heaven, kings of the earth, and all others who bear rule in the ſeveral parts of the world; perſons conſecrated to religious purpoſes, powers and preheminences, prelates and their ſubordinate dignitaries in the church, the venerable miniſters of juſtice, and men of *eminence* in every order and profeſſion—ſhall theſe, ſay you, be looked upon as beings ſunk down by the

---

tur poſtulandum a nobis eſt ut quis ea fecerit inſtitueritque dicamus. Poſſimus nulla cum reprehenſione neſcire quis et illis originem dederit. St. Cyp. Adv. Gent. L. 2. p. 34.

weight

weight of a *pre-exiſtent* guilt? Is this, in any degree, credible? What! ſhall we dare to view *majeſty* itſelf in ſo unfavourable, ſo uncomfortable a light? And are all—even all---princes, prelates, peaſants, pedlars, in the eye of the Deity, on one and the ſame ignominious level?

§ 22. In anſwer to theſe queries I muſt, in the firſt place, obſerve, that the *marvelouſneſs* of a doctrine is not, of *itſelf*, a ſufficient foundation for a diſbelief of it, it being no uncommon thing for errors to be admitted for truths, *only* becauſe they are *popular*, or *eſtabliſhed* errors, which the many ſucceſſive deviations from *old* received *ſyſtems*, eccleſiaſtical or civil, ſpeculative or philoſophic, abundantly evince; and that therefore *novelty* is as likely to have truth on its ſide as *antiquity**.

§ 23. I muſt, in the ſecond place, deſire the reader to give due attention to what has been already obſerved; that, even ſuppoſing our deſcent hither to be the reſult of a pre-exiſtent guilt; it does not therefore, follow, either that all of us are criminal in the ſame reſpect, nor even any of us upon a footing with the apoſtate angels, or in an equal degree objects of the divine diſpleaſure. But, that ſcripture in expreſs terms fixes upon *all*, *majeſty* itſelf not excepted, an original, inherent guilt and drepravity of nature, the reader will not, I apprehend, diſpute; and as the honour and equity of God, and the credit, dignity, and authority of our religion, require this queſtion fairly to be diſcuſſed, viz. whether ſcripture aſcribes that original guilt, &c. to the *imputed* treſ-

* Error is old, ſays a Greek Father, therefore truth ſeemeth new—παλαια δε η πλανη, καινον δε αληθεια. Clem. προτρεπτ. P m. 4.

paſſes

paſſes of our firſt parents, or to a perſonal pre-exiſtent default in ourſelves, let reaſon, the grand criterion of truth, and the only infallible interpreter of ſcripture-doctrines, determine the point, and my hypotheſis will not appear, perhaps, more marvellous than manly, rational, and, I had almoſt ſaid, unqueſtionable.

§ 24. And then, thirdly, though the high honours, pre-eminences and powers, to which many by birth, others by a ſeries of fortunate events, arrive, may, from a ſuperficial view of things induce us to conſider the glittering proprietors thereof, rather as peculiar *favourites* of heaven, than *lapſed* apoſtates from his power and authority; yet how very ill grounded ſuch a concluſion very often is, experience too frequently proves. Many of the *fancied bleſſings* of life are oft-times given in the Deity's wrath, and, in order to ſhew how equally contemptible, in his ſight, are both the receiver and the gift. Nor could providence more effectually convince the world what a ſhare of pride, vanity, cruelty, want of feeling for the diſtreſſes of others, &c. lodged in the heart of ſome, than by heaping on them riches, or inveſting them with power and authority! In many others, indeed, we cannot help conſidering them as tokens of the divine favour, and rewards of a prior *comparative* degree of merit. And though *royalty*, in particular, wears too frequently the image of the *ruler of this world*, the prince of the powers of *darkneſs*, yet ſometimes (as it does *now* in an *unuſual* degree on the inhabitants of *this* iſle) it ſhines with the ineffable glories of piety, purity and ſteady patriotiſm. Majeſty, ſo arrayed, beſpeaks an original ſuperior to the common race of lapſed beings, and almoſt tempts

the inferior claſs of mortals to ſay, of perſonages *ſo dignified*, "The Gods are come down to us, in the likeneſs of men." And when riches and honours are beſtowed on others, whoſe delight it is to employ them to the comfort and happineſs of their fellow creatures, there is no doubt but that providence *ſingled* them out as perſons moſt *worthy* to be entruſted with the happy *opportunity* of doing good.

Objec. IV. It may ſtill be urged, that this world is ſo far from being a ſtate of puniſhment and excluſion from happineſs, which the doctrine of a lapſe of human ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate ſuppoſes, that, upon the whole, it is productive of public and private happineſs in great abundance.

With reſpect to the firſt, viz. *public* happineſs, and to that *Canaan* of happineſs, which *Britons* enjoy, compared with others, it may, perhaps, be deemed (and I wiſh we were ſufficiently ſenſible of the difference) what the objection ſuppoſes. Heaven be praiſed, we have none of the miſeries under which other nations are ofttimes labouring! Ours is not now the horrid ſeat of war; nor are plagues peſtilences, fiery irruptions, and devouring earthquakes, the deſolating horrors of this our Sion; nor are galling oppreſſions of tyrants, nor rude and ſavage barbarities, common amongſt us: but, are not theſe the miſeries, under which groan more or leſs, a great, I might ſay the far greateſt part of the Globe.

§ 25. Carry we, then, ourſelves into a view of detached pictures of the world, and what are the moſt exalted gratifications here, when contraſted with that portion of bliſs which we have forfeited, and to which we can be reſtored by Chriſtianity only. Are they more than ſo many play-things in the hands of children, far ſhort of manly enjoyments, and

and of a rational and ample fruition? And if to theſe we add, the incidental misfortunes, diſquietudes, and deep calamities of life, can we be ſaid to enjoy a—life of happineſs? Is it not at beſt a life of diſſatisfaction?

§ 26. I am apt to think, ſays Mr. Woollaſton, with reſpect to private felicity, that, even among thoſe whoſe ſtate is beheld with envy, there are *many* who, if at the end of their courſe they were put to their option, whether, without any reſpect to a future ſtate, they would repeat all the pleaſures they have had in life, upon condition, to go over again alſo all the diſappointments, the ſame vexations and unkind treatment from the world, the ſame ſecret pangs and tedious hours, the ſame labours of the body and mind, the ſame pains and ſickneſſes, would be far from accepting them at that price. But here the caſe, as I have put it, only reſpects them who may be reckoned among the more *fortunate paſſengers*; and for one that makes his voyage ſo well, thouſands are toſt in tempeſts and loſt.

How many never attain any comfortable ſettlement in the world? How many fail, after they have attained it, by various misfortunes? What melancholy, what diſtractions are cauſed in families, by inhuman or vicious huſbands; falſe or peeviſh wives; refractory or unhappy children; and if they are otherwiſe, if they are good, what ſorrow for the loſs of them? How many are forced by neceſſity upon drudging and very ſhocking employments, for a poor livelihood? How many ſubſiſt upon begging, borrowing, and other ſhifts, nor can do otherwiſe? How many meet with ſad accidents, or fall into deplorable diſeaſes? are not all companies, and the very ſtreets filled with complaints and grie-

vances, and doleful ſtories? I verily believe, that a great part of mankind may aſcribe their deaths to want and dejection. Woollaſton Rel. Nat. p. 207.

§ 27. But allowing, what can by no means be denied, that there are many in life who experience a continued ſeries of real comforts, real enjoyments, yet the queſtion is, with what view they are vouchſafed by the diſpoſer of all things, and on what account? It is certain that a ſuperiority of poſſeſſions, titles and power, do not happen by meer chance, and with no particular view in deity reſpecting thoſe to whom they are allotted. A *paradiſe* was prepared for Adam, for one to whom the deity *knew* it would be an *undeſerved* bleſſing. And temporal bleſſings were perpetually pouring down on the *peculiar* people of God, a people *peculiar* only for their *ingratitude*. From whence we may conclude that the many advantages in life, are in general no more than deſigned trials of a man's behaviour in the poſſeſſion of them; the particulars of whoſe conduct are repoſed, unknown to the poſſeſſor, in the breaſt of God, to be produced againſt him in the laſt great day of accounts, when it will appear that it had been infinitely more to his *real* advantage never to have been poſſeſſed of them, than to have made (as he will then ſee though too late) that he has made ſo unworthy an uſe of them. Conſider this for your own ſakes, all ye *great* ones; and learn from hence ye *little* ones how to eſtimate aright your deſpiſed *littleneſs*.

§ 28. Objec. V. It may be urged, if the ſoul did actually exiſt in a prior ſtate, it is very extraordinary, that that pre-exiſtence ſhould not have been intimated to us in the *moſaic hiſtory* of

of the creation; whereas that evidently ſuppoſes the *ſoul* of man, as well as his *body*, to have been then *firſt* formed by the Creator.

That the Moſaic creation was not the original creation, I have endeavoured to prove already, and that the *deſign* of the Moſaic hiſtory accounts for its ſilence with reſpect to a lapſe of human ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate, the reader will ſee from what follows.

It is certain ſays St. *Baſil*, that Moſes did not deſign to write of the creation of *all things*, but only of things *viſible* and *corporeal*.

He is wholly ſilent with reſpect to the creation of human ſouls, whence the divines of the Chriſtian church are, as ſays Brockleſby (p. 502.) extremely at a loſs, *de origine animæ*, not knowing which of the three opinions to prefer, that of the pre-exiſtence of ſouls, or that of their creation, and infuſion by the immediate hand of God, in ſucceſſive generations; or that which derives them from propagation. Which total ſilence, touching the origin of ſouls, is a plain indication, that the creation of them was no part of the Moſaic creation.

§ 29. And, it is evident that the Moſaic hiſtory of the creation is, in the whole of it, nothing elſe but an hiſtory of the production of a world of terreſtrial animals, and of God's making proviſion for them as ſuch; and reaches to nothing higher, than the making ſuch a terreſtrial animal as man, not aſcending to the creation of his intellectual ſoul. It aſcends not to the creation of any living creature higher than terreſtrial animals, ſays not a word of the creation of angels; and, as a Jewiſh writer obſerves, in the hiſtory of the creation, only viſibles, *quæ viſu per-*

percipiunter, are treated of; ſuch as heaven, the earth, moon and ſtars, plants, animals, and ſuch like; not ſuch things as, being immaterial, are diſcernable only by the mind. Menaſſ. Ben. Iſr. Qu. in Gen. p. 21. Nor is the ſilence of Moſes, with reſpect to the pre-exiſtence of ſouls, at all to be wondered at, when we conſider how many truths of the utmoſt importance are left totally unnoticed by him. He ſays nothing of the knowledge of God, nothing of his eſſence and attributes, nothing of his divine nature and ſovereignty, nothing of his rights, dues, and prerogatives, nothing of true worſhip and ſervice, nor even any thing of the ſervice of ſacrifice. And though man is eſſentially, more or leſs, a religious animal, is neceſſarily under the law of religion, and has the law of nature written, as is ſuppoſed, on his heart, yet even of the law of nature, and the multifarious branches of it, there is no mention at all in the Moſaic hiſtory, no moral philoſophy, no divine morality, nor any of the great rules and precepts of ſobriety, righteouſneſs, and godlineſs. And ſo, though man is allowed to be poſſeſſed of an heaven-born ſoul, yet there is as little notice taken in the Moſaic creation, of the heaven-born ſoul of man, as there is of the creation and fall of angels, and that is none at all; nothing of the origin and immortality of the ſoul, nothing relative to its preſent and future felicity, nothing of the end and buſineſs, the holineſs, and true happineſs of man; nothing of ſalvation and the way to it; nothing of another world, nothing of either heaven or hell; or of ſpirituals and eternals. The Moſaic hiſtory, therefore, being nothing elſe, as to the letter of it, but an hiſtory of what belongs to God's creating terreſtrial animals,

mals, as ſuch, and making for them a ſuitable proviſion, it is no reaſonable objection to the belief of the ſoul's prior exiſtence, that no mention of it is made in the Moſaic hiſtory of the creation*.

§ 30. Ob. V. Admiting for argument ſake that the entire ſilence in the *pentateuch* concerning a *Lapſe of ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate* is ſufficiently accounted for above, yet how ſtrange is it that no actual *declaration* of it ſhould have been made by *Chriſt*, and that his *diſciples* ſhould have been totally ignorant of any ſuch event?

To this objection be pleaſed to accept of the following reply.

Whoever will ſeriouſly conſider, ſays Dr. Butler, that part of the Chriſtian ſcheme which is revealed in ſcripture, will find ſo much unrevealed, as will convince him, that to all the purpoſes of objecting and judging, we know as little of it as of the conſtitution of nature. Butler's Analogy p. 275.

§ 31. This is not at all to be wondered at when we take into our conſideration a circumſtance, to which there ſeems not to have been given, as yet, the due attention, viz. that added to the want of thoſe informations, which were purpoſely ſuppreſſed by our Saviour, as above-intimated, we find even the apoſtle St. Paul, who was *ſeparated unto the goſpel of Chriſt*, acting no leſs upon the reſerve throughout the whole courſe of his miniſtry; either *partially* relating, or purpoſely inveloping in myſtic types and alluſions, many things relative to the goſpel diſpenſation. An obſervation, the truth of which is confirmed by his own expreſs declaration. For though he diſcloſed, from time to time, the arcana of the goſpel œconomy to a ſelect deſerving *few—to them who were perfect*, as he ſays, yet in general he ſpake the

wiſdom

* Vid. Brockleſby, p. 512.

wiſdom of God in a myſtery. We ſpeak wiſdom, ſays he, *among them who* are *perfect*; yet, *not the wiſdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that came to nought.*

But we ſpeak (to the bulk of his hearers he means) *the wiſdom of God in a myſtery.*

§ 32. He had before obſerved, to the Corinthians, that diſdaining altogether the glittering pomp of eloquence, or a vain oſtentatious ſhew of human wiſdom, he had, with the utmoſt plainneſs and ſimplicity of ſpeech, declared to them the *teſtimony of God*; ſolicitous only to inculcate for the preſent, and as a foundation for their further progreſs in the knowledge of Chriſtianity, the belief of *Jeſus Chriſt and him crucified.* Some of the more remote, recondite truths, contained in that *belief* (though not all of them, for a reaſon which will hereafter occur) he reſerved for the information *of the perfect*—for the ſincere, humble, rightly *diſpoſed* convert*.

Whence it follows, that the apoſtle's *full and thorough inſight* into the nature, tenor, and ſeveral circumſtances of the goſpel diſpenſation, is not eaſily, if at all, to be collected from what is tranſmitted to us in his epiſtles; in which, as St. Peter ſays, there are ſome things *hard to be underſtood.*

---

* Credendum *omnibus* proponitur Chriſtum mortuum eſſe ut nos e Poteſtate diaboli eriperet. *Perfectis* autem dicitur quo Jure totum humanum genus in Diaboli Poteſtatem fuerit redactum: ac rurſus quo Jure & Æquitate per Chriſti Mortem fuerit inde ereptum. And again, as a comment on *We ſpeak the wiſdom of God in a myſtery*, it is added.—Sapientiam Dei quæ abſcondita eſt, id eſt Concilia divinæ ſapientiæ, quæ Deus eſſe voluit abſcondita & ante Filii ſui Paſſionem pauciſſimis revelata, loquimur & docemus *non propalam & paſſim apud omnes* (quia non *omnes* ea capiunt) ſed in Myſterio & apud *pauciores*. Vid. Eſtium in Loco.

Ac-

Account, ſays he, *that the long ſuffering of our Lord is ſalvation; even as our brother Paul alſo, according to the wiſdom given unto him, hath written unto you.*

As alſo, in all his epiſtles *ſpeaking in them of theſe things in which are ſome things* hard to be underſtood, 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

§ 33. That the epiſtle, to which the words γεγραψεν ὑμιν written *unto you*, particularly refers, is that of St. Paul to the Hebrews*; and not, as is uſually judged, to the 2d chapter of his epiſtle to the Romans, the learned Eſtius has, I think, proved beyond diſpute. Nor is it leſs evident that St. Peter alludes not to this or that *particular paſſage*, in that epiſtle to the Hebrews, but to the whole thread of reaſoning (the major part of it however) therein contained; and further, that the obſcurity which he aſcribes to that epiſtle in particular, he ſuppoſes to be applicable likewiſe to all his epiſtles in general.

As alſo in all his epiſtles ſpeaking in them of thoſe things, &c. in *which* ἐν αἷς (not ἐν αἷς as ſome copies erroneouſly have it) in which *epiſtles* are ſome things *hard* to be *underſtood*.

From which paſſage the ſame judicious commentator draws the following inference. It is abundantly evident, ſays he, that St. Peter affirms, that there are in St. Paul's epiſtles, things hard to be underſtood; and at the ſame time that it is a common thing for the other ſcriptures, as well as St. Paul's epiſtles, to be miſinterpreted and perverted by the unlearned†.

---

* And principally to the eleventh chapter of that epiſtle, according to Dr. Hammond.

† Apertiſſimum eſt hoc Petri Teſtimonium in iis quæ ſcripſit Paulus eſſe quædam intellectu difficilia; ſimul indicans et cæteris Scripturis id eſſe commune quod et eas ſicut Pauli Scripta depravent Homines indocti. Vid Eſtium in Loco.

§ 34. The reader is not, however, to infer from hence, that in the Δυσνοητα aſcribed to St. Paul's epiſtles—the *things hard to be underſtood*, the neceſſary indiſpenſable creadenda of a Chriſtian, truths, the belief of which is eſſential to ſalvation, are included, the contrary being abundantly evident. A lively *operative* faith in Chriſt, as the Redeemer of mankind, which is the very baſis, nay, and even the ſum and ſubſtance of Chriſtianity is not only the plain, *obvious* object of the apoſtle's miniſtry, but a conſtant topic of exhortation throughout his whole epiſtles. A faith, which (actuated and enlivened, I ſay, by a correſpondent purity of life) has given, I doubt not, all who have lived and died therein, an unqueſtioned paſport to the regions of bliſs; incapable as they were of fathoming *the depth of the riches of the wiſdom and goodneſs of God*, diſplayed in the great work of man's redemption, of framing to themſelves any idea of an atonement *due* to a pre-exiſtent ſtate of guilt, or of conceiving that a bleſſing, greater or more extenſive, was accompliſhed by Chriſt's mediation, interceſſion, &c*. than a deliverance from the evils conſequent on Adam's treſpaſs. Theſe are points to which the apoſtle, I own, does but either diſtantly allude or myſteriouſly inculcate; concluding as we may ſuppoſe, that, in after times, the SPIRIT OF TRUTH would, by due degrees, lead mankind into a diſcovery of thoſe and many other important truths, reſpecting the

---

* That the *death* of Chriſt was made a *condition* of our redemption, or that *it* was any thing more than a *contingent* conſequence of his miniſtry (and as ſuch *foreſeen*, *propheſied*, and *prefigured* of old, and alluded to in the Moſaic rites and ſacrifices, &c.) it is neither eaſy of belief, nor capable, I think, of ſcripture proof—But as to this let every one judge for himſelf.

media-

mediatorial œconomy, which neither the world was then *capable* of receiving, or he himſelf *at liberty* openly to diſcloſe. That they are, however, the leſs credible from the want of an expreſs, poſitive declaration from the apoſtle, we ſhould not haſtily conclude, when we conſider (and I hope the conſideration will have its due weight) that the apoſtle was, by virtue of that extraordinary viſion vouchſafed to him—2 Cor. xii.--undoubtedly poſſeſſed of a fuller and more intimate knowledge of the myſteries of the goſpel diſpenſation, than he was permitted to *make known*. And that the diſcoveries then made, were of ſuch a nature, as greatly exalted the dignity of the Chriſtian œconomy, is evident, from the exceſs of vanity, to which the communication of them had well-nigh drove the apoſtle, and on account of which the meſſenger of Satan was ſent to buffet him.

That thoſe diſcoveries *did* relate to a pre-exiſtent guilt, and a redemption from it, by the death of Chriſt, there is indeed no actual proof from ſcripture. But whether *our* ideas of the mediatorial diſpenſation are not tranſcendantly *exhalted* by viewing it through the medium of a ſuppoſed perſonal pre-exiſtent guilt and appoſtacy, inſtead of a derived *Adamic* treſpaſs and defilement, let the judicious, ſerious, and impartial reader determine.

§ 35. But as a farther, more direct, and full anſwer to the above objection, I will give the reader another extract from that valuable tract, the new Practice of Piety.

I am not ſtartled, ſays he, that I find not Chriſt nor any of his apoſtles aſſerting, or ſo much as mentioning any ſuch doctrine (the doctrine of pre-exiſtence.) St. John's hyperbole in the laſt verſe of his goſpel, ſatisfies me, that I

muſt not expect to find all that our Saviour did and ſaid, regiſtered by the evangeliſts: And St. Paul's frequent exhortation, to hold faſt the tradition that he had imparted to them, whether by word or epiſtle, convinces me, that it is not unreaſonable to conclude that he delivered many doctrines in his ſermons, which he had no occaſion to mention in his letters to the church, among which this might be one. However it is a ſufficient warrant to my belief, that I no where in all the ſcriptures can find this doctrine reprehended; which had it been an error, could not have eſcaped the cenſure of Chriſt and his apoſtles, it being the univerſal tenet of all ſorts of Jews except the ſaduces. When I conſider that Origen and Ammonius taught it in the ſchools of Alexandria (Plotinus himſelf learning it from the latter,) and that all the primitive fathers, who were Platoniſts, aſſerted it not only as a philoſophical, but alſo as a divine truth; I look upon it as an effect of Gothic barbarity and ignorance, which afterwards overſpread all *Chriſtendom*, that neither this, nor hardly any other point of Platoniſm were countenanced in the Chriſtian ſchools.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

An APPLICATION of the Whole.

Ap. 1. § 1. FROM the view which we have taken of a ſuppoſed lapſe of human ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate, there opens to the intellectual eye an entire conſiſtency in that grand landſcape of nature, man's terreſtrial abode; and the whole courſe of divine providence towards him, from the creation of the world, to its preſent ſtate.

It enables us in the firſt place, to ſee in what manner, and with what advantageous views reſpecting man, *natural* and *moral* evil were introduced into the world.

§ 2. Upon an exalted ſcheme of compaſſion for undone creatures, to introduce into a ſtate of trial, and probation, a ſelect number of the lapſed race, ſnatched, as it were, from the jaws of the great dragon, and to enable them to recover, if they pleaſed, their forfeited happineſs, was Adam ſent into the world in the manner and form deſcribed by the ſacred hiſtorian. And, though created after God's image, i. e. with ſuch intellectual powers and faculties, as are in nature, though not in degree reſembling thoſe, by which the infinite and eternal mind is governed *, yet we find him here accompanied with

* When Moſes ſays, "God created man in his own "image," we muſt conſider the image of God in the Old Teſtament notion of it; and it cannot be ſhewn that the image of God in the Old Teſtament, ever ſignifies the divine, *virtuous* image of God. No ſuch notion of it appears in

with that inſtability, and depravity of nature, which he had acquir'd by his departure from original rectitude *above*.—And here, if infinite mercy had not interpoſed, the laſt ſtate of man had been worſe than the *firſt* *.

§ 3. Myriads

---

in the Old Teſtament, but, on the contrary, mankind conſidered as merely animal, are ſuppoſed to *bear God's image:*

Whoſo ſhedeth man's blood, by man ſhall his blood be ſhed: for in the image of God made he man. Gen. ix. 6.

So alſo in the New Teſtament.

Therewith curſe we men, that are made after the ſimilitude of God, James iii. 9.

For a man ought not to cover his head, foraſmuch as he is the image and glory of God. 1 Cor. xi. 7.

But the image of God in Adam, conſiſted principally in his being a kind of repreſentative lord of the creation. Let us make man, ſays God, in our image, after our likeneſs, and let them have dominion over the fiſh of the ſea, and over the fowls of the air, &c.—in our image, after our likeneſs, i. e. in our ſtead.

* " Even ſuppoſing, ſays Glanville, that Adam had not " been a delinquent before his noted tranſgreſſion in a ter- " reſtrial body, and that his body had vaſt advantages over " ours, in point of beauty, purity, and ſerviceableneſs to " the ſoul, what hardſhip is there in conceiving that God " might ſend one of thoſe *immaculate* ſpirits, that he had " made, into ſuch a tenement, that he might be an over- " ſeer and ruler of thoſe other creatures, that he had order- " ed to have their dwelling upon earth. I am ſure, ſays he, " that there is no more contrariety to any of the divine at- " tributes in this ſuppoſition, than there is in that, which " makes God to have ſent a pure ſpirit, which he had juſt " made, into ſuch a body. But then ſuppoſing that ſome " ſouls fell when the angels did, (which he ſhews is no un- " reaſonable ſuppoſition) this was a merciful proviſion of " our Maker, and a generous undertaking for a ſeraphic " and untainted ſpirit. For by this means, fit and congru- " ous *matter* is prepared for ſouls to reſide and act in, who " had rendered themſelves unfit to live and enjoy themſelves " in more refined bodies. And ſo thoſe ſpirits that had ſin- " ned themſelves into a ſtate of ſilence, and inactivity, are " by this reaſonable means, which the divine wiſdom and " goodneſs

§ 3. Myriads of the fallen race were to iſſue from his loins. He was to introduce them into a new probatory ſcene of action, was to become a kind of ſurety for their after conduct, and in conſequence of a *right behaviour* in all, was to bring them back to their former ſtate of glory. But having, together with the mother of mankind, loſt ſight of his duty to his Maker here, by eating the forbidden fruit, he again fell a ſacrifice to the divine vengeance, and involved his unhappy offſpring in the ruinous conſequence.

§ 4. Natural and moral evil then flowed in apace. Now it was that *ſin* entered into the *world*, and that greateſt of *natural* evils, together with its uſual forerunners, bodily pains, infirmities, and gradual decays,) *death* by ſin, ariſing, not improbably, from a malignant efficacy, eſſential to the fruit forbiden *.

§ 5. So

" goodneſs hath contrived for that purpoſe, put once more " into a capacity of acting their parts anew, and coming in- " to play again. Now if it ſeems hard, continues he, to " conceive, how ſo noble a ſpirit, in ſuch an advantageous " body, ſhould have been impoſed upon by ſo groſs a delu- " ſion, and ſubmit ſo impotently to the firſt temptation, he " may pleaſe to conſider that the difficulty is the ſame, ſup- " poſing him juſt then to have been made, if we grant him " but that purity, and thoſe perfections, both of will and " underſtanding, which orthodox theology allows him. Yet " I might aſk again, ſays he, what inconvenience there is " in ſuppoſing, that Adam himſelf was one of thoſe delin- " quent ſouls, which the divine piety, and compaſſion, had " thus ſet up again; that ſo many of his excellent creatures " might not be loſt, and undone irrecoverably; but might " act anew, though upon a lower ſtage, in the univerſe? A " due conſideration of the infinite fœcundity of divine good- " neſs, ſays he, will, if not warrant, yet excuſe ſuch a ſup- " poſition."

Vid. *Glanville*'s Lux Orientalis.—pag. 31, 32.

* Before Adam had eaten the forbiden fruit, a divine beauty

§ 5. So that inſtead of being removed, as was the peculiar indulgence vouchſafed to Enoch and Elijah, by a *direct* tranſlation from earth to the region of pure ſpirits, which would have been the caſe moſt probably, if he, on whom our *terrene* fate depended, had not ſinned *here*, we have now the mortification to find that our paſſage to it muſt be through the dark chambers of the grave, and that through a kind of phyſical neceſſity. For the ſame frail periſhable body which Adam contracted by his tranſgreſſion deſcending of courſe to his poſterity, nothing but a miraculous interpoſition of divine power, an immediate renovation of the protoplaſt's corporeal frame could prevent this from being the unhappy conſequence *.

---

beauty and majeſty was ſhed upon his body, ſuch as could neither be eclipſed by ſickneſs, nor extinguiſhed by death: nature was his phyſician, and prudence, and abſtinence would have kept him healthful to immortality. Stack. Hiſt. B. 1. c. 2. p. 37.

* Agreeably to which, ſays the author of the book of wiſdom, God created man to be immortal, but through the envy of the devil, death entered into the world. Wiſdom. 23, 24. And again.—By the woman was the beginning of ſin, ſays the wiſe ſon of Sirach, and by her we all die. Eccl. 25, 2. By the counſel which the ſerpent gave to Eve, all the inhabitants of the earth became obnoxious to death, ſays the Targum, on Ruth, 4. v. ult. And the ſame Chaldee paraphraſe upon Eccleſ. c. 7. v. ult. ſays, God made man pure and upright, but the Serpent and Eve ſeduced him to eat of the fruit of the tree, and ſo they made death to ruſh in upon him, and all the inhabitants of the earth.

It ſeems to be no ill-grounded conjecture of ſome, that the forbidden tree, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, brought forth fruit the reverſe of that which was produced by the tree of life. And they take this tree to have been of the nature of that Indian fig deſcribed by Pliny, whoſe fruit was ſweeter than an apple, but of a juice moſt baneful to the human conſtitution; for which reaſon Alexander, in his expedition gave ſtrict orders that none of his army ſhould touch that fruit. Plin. hiſt. l. 12. c. 6.

§ 6. But

§ 5. But is it not hard, after all, ſays the free-thinker and enquirer, that things ſhould be ſo unhappily circumſtanced with reſpect to the off-ſpring of Adam, as that the innocent ſhould be made ſharers in the puniſhment due only to the guilty? And the anſwer uſually given to the queſtion is what? Why—*As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all* be made alive *. As if it argued no degree of inconſiſtency and injuſtice in divine providence, to have recourſe to and avail himſelf of the death of him *who knew no ſin*, in order to repair the damages the innocent off-ſpring of Adam ſuſtained *ſolely* on account of their parents tranſgreſſion—A tranſgreſſion too which could not but have been foreſeen. Notwithſtanding however the *abſurdity*, (might I not ſay *impiety?*) of ſuch a ſuppoſition that calamity, *death*, has hitherto been generally aſcribed to Adam's tranſgreſſion, as the *primary* and *ſole* cauſe when ſcripture, ſo agreeably to the dictates of reaſon and reflection, declares, plainly and poſitively, that we ſhare that part of the puniſhment inflicted on Adam's ſin, *only* by having been ourſelves ſinners in a prior ſtate; for what ſays the apoſtle? Death paſſed upon all men, for that, or *becauſe* that (ἐφ ᾧ eo quod, or as Eraſmus renders it, *quatenus*,) all *had* ſinned.

§ 6. That this is the true import of the above paſſage we learn from the apoſtle's drift in the whole chapter; which is to amplify, or illuſtrate the merit of the redemption of the world by Chriſt. In order, therefore, to obviate any plea, that might perhaps be urged in behalf of the deſcendants of Adam, as ſuppoſed to be innocently, and as ſuch wrongfully involved in the conſequences of his guilt, and of courſe, *intitled* to a

* This text will be conſidered as we go along.

redemption from death and deſtruction; he takes upon him to convince them, that, incapable as they were of incurring the *guilt* for which Adam died, yet, having been *before perſonally* ſinners themſelves, *they* ſhared, not unjuſtly, the puniſhment inflicted on *him*.

As by one man ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin, *even* ſo (for that is the true meaning of και ουτως) *even* ſo death paſſed upon all men *for* or *becauſe* that all *had ſinned*.

§ 7. The more common tranſlation of the paſſage is arrant nonſenſe.

Wherefore, *as* by one man, ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin, and ſo death paſſed upon all men, foraſmuch as all have ſinned.—Well, and what then? Why nothing at all follows to make the ſenſe complete, even allowing a parentheſis to extend as far as you pleaſe. In what ſenſe, then, all *had ſinned*, we learn from the ſcope of the apoſtle's reaſoning throughout the whole chapter.

Doubtleſs one will ſcarce die, ſays he, for a *righteous* man, i. e. for one, who being *perſonally* righteous, could ſtand in *need* of a redeemer; yet for a *good man*—one from whom ſome *good* may have been received—it may be that one might even dare to die. *But herein is God's love manifeſted towards us*, ſays he, *in that while we were ſinners*, neither *juſt* nor *good*, (in a ſtate of *original* ſin moſt undoubtedly, for the apoſtles and other believers in Chriſt, could not be ſuppoſed to be then labouring under a continued courſe of *preſent* ſin) *while we were yet ſinners*, Chriſt died for us. And in order to *ſhew*, that it was ſome *pre-exiſtent* guilt in man, for which Chriſt died, the apoſtle reaſons as follows.—

§ 8. *Unto the time of the law*, ſays he, *was ſin in the world, but ſin is not imputed while there is no law*

law. But death reigned from Adam to Moſes, even over them alſo, that ſinned not after the manner of the tranſgreſſion of Adam, who was the figure of him that was to come, i. e. Sin was in the world prior to the law, [αχρι νομε, *uſque ad Legem*], but to what law? To the law given by God to Adam, or to that delivered to Moſes? Not to the latter aſſuredly, becauſe ſin *was* imputed *before* the Moſaic law commenced. Witneſs the ſentence of death executed upon Adam, and the ſucceeding race; the puniſhment inflicted on Cain; the deſtruction of the world by a general deluge; the judicial confuſion at the building of the *Tower of Babel*; the overthrow of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*; the fate of *Lot*'s wife; *Simeon* and *Levi*'s revenge on *Hamor*, and *Shechem* for the rape committed on *Dinah*; and the multiplied judgments on *Pharaoh*, and on the people of the land of *Egypt*.

§ 9. By the law therefore, prior to which ſin entered into the world, and to which the Apoſtle muſt be ſuppoſed to allude, we muſt undoubtedly underſtand the *law of God given to Adam*. And as the puniſhment for ſin was inflicted even on thoſe, who had not been tranſgreſſors of *that* law, the ſufferers muſt of courſe have been treſpaſſers in a *prior ſtate*, for *ſin is not imputed where there is no law*. But death [the wages of Sin] *reigned from Adam to Moſes even over them* that had not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion, *who was the image of him that was to come* i. e. who by involving *pre-exiſtent* ſinners into the miſeries denounced on *his* perſonal tranſgreſſions *here*, the principal of which is a frail, corruptible, *mortal* body, bore a kind of contradiſtinct reſemblance of him, who gave them an undeſerved ſhare in the benefits ariſing to mankind by the *merit* of his own perſonal attonement for ſin in general.

And ſo it is that—*By man came death*, and that *by man came alſo the reſurrection of the dead*: So it is, that—*As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive* *.

§ 10. As the infection of ſin (a pre-exiſtent ſin) remained among the *poſterity* of Adam, it was no impeachment of divine juſtice, that death, the puniſhment denounced upon *his* tranſgreſſion, ſhould be tranſmitted to *them* likewiſe—*all* having ſinned.—

§ 11. And that the other intermediate evils (*natural* evils I mean) ariſe from the ſame ſource, Scripture aſſurs us in expreſs terms †.

Curſed is the ground for his ſake; *in ſorrow do we eat of it*, more or leſs, *all the days of our life*; *thorns alſo, and thiſtles it brings forth*; *and we eat of the herb of the field*; *in the ſweat of our brow* ‡ we

---

* If however it ſhould be inſiſted on, that the apoſtle alludes not to the law given by God to Adam, but to the law of Moſes, I don't ſee but my argument is of equal force notwithſtanding, it being evident from the apoſtle's own words, that *before* the latter, there was a ſin *not* imputed, and what could that be but men's original pre-exiſtent ſin, when as we have obſerved above, *other* ſins were actually imputed and puniſhed.

† "It is evident, that evil ought to be prevented if it "be poſſible, and that it is a ſinful thing not to prevent it "when it can be prevented. Nevertheleſs our theology ſhews "us, that this is falſe; it teaches us, that God does no-"thing but what becomes his perfections, when he permits "all the diſorders that are in the world, and which he might "have prevented." This is part of a conference between two Abbots which Mr. Bayle introduces into his account of the Life of Pyrroh; wherein a reflection is caſt upon the Deity, in permitting the introduction and continuance of evil in the world, which is ſufficiently removed, by ſuppoſing it the reſult of a lapſe of ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate.

‡ Some conclude from hence, that the earth, before the fall, brought forth ſpontaneouſly; and indeed in ſome meaſure

we eat bread, till we return to the ground; for out of it we were taken. Duſt we are, and unto duſt we muſt return. And it was not *mankind* only which felt the ſad effects of the introduction of ſin, but even the inanimate part of the creation ſuffered by it. The fertility of the earth, and ſerenity of the air were changed; the elements began to jar, the ſeaſons, and the weather grew uncertain. See Stack. hiſt. p. 43. Milton * introduces God ſoon after the fall, appointing Angels to make an alteration in the courſe of celeſtial bodies, and to poſſeſs them with noxious qualities, in order to deſtroy the fertility of the earth, and thereby puniſh man for his diſobedience.

§ 12. Thus the introduction of *natural* evil among *pre-exiſtent* ſinners, on account of *Adam*'s appears conſiſtent with our ideas of infinite equity and wiſdom; we ſhall ſee now, how neceſſarily *moral* evil iſſued from the ſame ſource.

The Jews ſuppoſed, that the body of Adam, before the fall, was not an ordinary human body, but approached to the angelic ſubtilty and purity. *Creatura fuit ſubtiliſſima & puriſſima proxime accedens ad Corpus ſpirituale.* See Brook. p. 464.

ſure, it is true, ſince all things were produced at firſt, by divine power, in full perfection, without toil or labour. Gen. i. 11, 12. But what labour would have been neceſſary in time, we know not, only the words imply, that much leſs toil would in that caſe have been requiſite. See Patr. in Loco. Other commentators obſerve, that by the ſweat of our brow is underſtood all manner of labour, whether of the body or the brain. Eccleſ. i. 13. As alſo what is grievous to a man in this life, either to do or ſuffer. See aſſembly of divines in Loco.

——— ——— * The ſun
Had firſt his precept ſo to move, ſo ſhine,
As might affect the earth with cold and heat
Scarce tolerable, and from the north to call
Decrepit Winter, from the ſouth to bring
Solſtitial ſummer's heat.— MIL. L. X. 951.

§ 13. But

§ 13. But this tenuous vehicle of the ſoul, after having imbibed the baneful juice of the forbidden fruit, degenerated by *degrees*, into a more groſs and indelicate conſiſtency; whence a group of ſenſual groveling appetites *unuſual*, aroſe of courſe. And as the degenerate nature of Adam's *body* becomes *neceſſarily* hereditary to us, who are his offspring, ſo in proportion muſt its concomitant groſs *paſſions* become *hereditary* too: *Hence that law in our members, warring againſt the law of our mind* *, *and bringing us into captivity to the law of ſin*; hence that *carnal mind, which is enmity againſt God.* Our ſouls are now cloathed with bodies calculated to adminiſter ſuch affections *only*, as are repugnant to, and incompatible with that purity of mind, to which a *ſpiritual* life only can enable us to attain, and wherein only it is poſſible for us to pleaſe God. This is that life, which Adam forfeited by his tranſgreſſion, and his poſterity ſink in the ruins of it. Hence it is, that we are ſtill dead in treſpaſſes and ſins; that in the midſt of life we are in death. The glory of the divine image, *before* eclipſed, is *now* more and more clouded, and obſcured by *carnal* luſts, and paſſions; the ſoul is, as it were, buried in ſinful *fleſh*, and totally unable to riſe again to its *original* ſplendor, till this *corruptible* ſhall have put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal* ſhall have put on *immortality* †.

Here

---

* Hence it is, that in our form of infant baptiſm, the prieſt ſo devoutly prays, that the *old Adam* in *that* child may "be ſo buried, that the *new* man may be raiſed up in him."

† I cannot think, with the learned Mr. *Law*, that this perfection of ſoul is at all attainable *here*. Scripture ſpeaks evidently a contrary doctrine. *That which is born of the fleſh*

is

§ 14. Here then we have a true and rational account of the introduction of *natural* and *moral* evil* into the world. *Natural* evil is apparently the offspring of *moral*, and the latter the unhappy product, not of Adam's treſpaſs, as its *primary* or *ſole* cauſe, but of a perſonal pre-exiſtent guilt in all who are derived from him.

---

is fleſh, ſays our Saviour; and of courſe (while it continues in the ſame ſtate) is ſinful, i. e. is liable to ſuch paſſions, as neceſſarily ſubject it to the law of ſin—that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit, i. e. it is pure, uncorrupt, ſinleſs; but ſuch are not we. We are *altogether abominable, there is none that doeth good, no, not one.* He that is of the earth, is earthly, and ſpeaketh of earth. And as fleſh and blood cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, ſo neither can righteouſneſs be reſtored to us *here:* for the King of righteouſneſs himſelf has declared, that his kingdom is not from *hence*; nay, and if we do all we can, it is peremptorily affirmed, that we are ſtill *unprofitable ſervants.* And if perfection was actually to be acquired *here*, how happened it, that the *converted* apoſtle could not become poſſeſſed of it? How came it, that there was ſtill that law in his members, warring, &c. and bringing him into captivity to the law of ſin? How, laſtly, came it to paſs, that humanity got the better, *for a time*, over even the divinity of Chriſt—that he was for giving up the cauſe for which he came into the world—was *deſirous*, that, if poſſible, the cup might paſs from him; intimating in the very act of reſignation to his approaching fate, that he was led to it, not by his *own will*, but by the *will of his Father*—not *my will*, ſays, he, but *thine* be done.

* The origin of evil, ſays Brockleſby, has a remarkable congruity in the Moſaic hiſtory; and it is, in the general nature of it, unexceptionable. For it derives the evil of puniſhment from the evil of ſin; and the evil of ſin—from the beginner of ſin, the devil.

Through envy of the devil (quem ſub ſerpentis figurâ Moſes intelligi voluit, ſays *Grotius*) came death into the world. And *Pherecydes Syrus* derives his οφιωνευς, princeps mali, as Origen thinks, from the Moſaic account of the ſerpent. And *Plato* is ſuppoſed to derive from thence his Story of *Jupiter*'s Gardens; and of *Porus* circumvented by *Penia*. Vid. C. Cels. l. 6. p. 304. Item. l. 4. p. 114. Euſeb. præpar. Evang. l. 12. c. 11.

And

And the advantages deducible from the reflection are as follow.

§ 15. They in the first place afford us a striking memorial of the calamitous effects of sin, and impiety in general, and of the heinousness of those *prior* offences from whence are derived to us the evils consequent on *Adam*'s sin in particular.

§ 16. They are, in the second place, proper medicines to heal our spiritual sickness, to correct the peccant humours in our intellectual and moral frame, to check the impetuosity of our inflamed and unruly appetites, and reduce us to a cool and consistent knowledge of ourselves, and our unhappy condition.

§ 17. When, in the third place, it is remembered, that we come into this world, as objects of the divine wrath, for some *pre-existent* acts of rebellion against heaven, will it be wondered, if we feel, now and then, a stroke from the rod of *justice*; or that the state into which we are banished for those crimes should be prolific of corrective difficulties, anxieties, and actual grievances?

APPLICATION 2.

The long permitted *sovereignty* of the devil in this inferior globe, the late appearance of the Messiah, and the past and present state of the heathen world, are all accounted for by the above hypothesis.

§ 18. When it shall be considered, that creatures, before basking in the beams of glory, nay, and even enjoying

——— ——— ———Their fill
Of bliss on bliss——— ——— ———
Imparadis'd in social joys, dropp'd gratitude;

that

that inattentive to the laws of juſtice, generoſity, and moral equity, they proſtituted that freedom of will, with which they were entruſted by their Maker, revolted by degrees to the traiterous rival of his power and dignity, and fixed their allegiance *there*—who does not ſee the wiſdom of divine providence in conſtituting *him*, who had been their ſeducer in a *prior* world, their king or potentate in *this?* that ſo by rendering his *permitted ſovereignty* here ineffectual for accompliſhing any thing but his and their own ruin, the vanity of his ambitious enterpriſes, and of their own truſt and confidence in *him*, might be render'd more conſpicuous. To *this* nothing could have contributed more, than the pre-ordained *late* appearance of the *Meſſiah* among men, to reſcue them from the power of the devil, and the multiplied miſeries iſſuing from it.

§ 19. For, in the firſt place, mankind had by this means more time to reflect on the wretchedneſs of their lapſed condition; and ſeeing by long experience their own inſufficiency to ſatisfy the divine juſtice, to cleanſe themſelves from their contracted pollutions, or regain their forfeited freedom, they of courſe became more and more convinced of the neceſſity of a Redeemer, (ſome more than human Redeemer,) to reſtore them to themſelves, to reconcile them to their offended God, and to reſcue them from the power of Satan.

§ 20. If then the Redeemer had been ſent into the world ſoon after the fall of Adam, or within an age or two after the flood, and checked by that means the devil's controul in its infancy, the manifeſtation of divine power in ſuch a ſignal conqueſt, and of conſe-

quence the glory ariſing from it, had been abundantly leſs conſiderable, than they afterwards were, when—*in the laſt days the Son of God was manifeſted, that he might deſtroy the works of the devil*—I ſay, in the *laſt days*, when the prince of darkneſs had ſo *widely* extended his dominions, and continued robbing the king of Heaven of almoſt all his ſubjects, in every province of his empire here below, excepting that of *Paleſtine* (nor was that totally exempt from Satanic ſway) —at ſuch a juncture, as this, when the apoſtacy of mankind became ſo *conſpicuous* and univerſal here, it was evidently moſt for the glory of God to aſſert his rightful ſovereignty, to pull down the uſurped empire of his rival, the prince of the apoſtate powers, and reſcue a captive world (in themſelves helpleſs, and hopeleſs, and yet deſirous at the ſame time of a deliverance) from the tyranny and oppreſſion of thoſe their ſpiritual *enemies*, whom they had *before* ſo unguardedly careſſed, as *friends*.

§ 21. If in the ſecond place, the Redeemer had come earlier into the world, than he did, men might have been tempted to regard the Almighty, as leſs provoked by their prior apoſtacy and rebellion, or more placable, condeſcending, and eaſy to be entreated, than might well comport with, either his dignity, majeſty, or honour *.

§ 22. And if there is ſtill a great part of the human race, to whom the arm of the Lord is not yet revealed, men, who ſtill ſit in darkneſs, or

* If it ſhould be urged, that theſe reflections would hold equally good, upon a ſuppoſed *imputed* guilt from Adam, as from a pretended *pre-exiſtent* tranſgreſſion, I will allow that they

on whom not a ſingle ray of the light of the goſpel has as yet ſhined; and who, being *unregenerate*, are of courſe under the dominion of the powers of darkneſs, with what an advantage does the goſpel diſpenſation appear? With what additional majeſty and luſtre does the ſun of righteouſneſs emerge, out of ſuch an Egyptian darkneſs? And who is ſo inſenſible of the bleſſings reſulting from that *light*, as not to learn, from ſuch a contraſted view of things, to prize more highly, to acknowledge with greater gratitude, and to covet, and embrace more ardently the great bleſſings of the goſpel diſpenſation?

§ 23. Are *they* borne down with the torrent of impetuous and unruly appetites, eſſential to *unregenerate* nature, hurried into enormities and ſavage cruelties, at the bare mention of which civilized humanity is ſhocked, and can ſcarce conſider as the deeds of *man?* How muſt that conſideration work upon *our* gratitude, to whom are propoſed the goſpel terms of ſalvation; by a ſincere and cordial acceptance of which we are renewed in the *ſpirit of our minds*, are turned from darkneſs to light, and from the power of *Satan* unto *God*, are furniſhed with the whole armour of God, and enabled to ſtand againſt the wiles of the devil; to combat the outrageous appetites of degenerate nature, and regain our loſt intereſt in Heaven.

---

they would, when I can be convinced that there is no *difference*, whether it be on the one account or on the other, that the world *lies in wickedneſs* and under the *power of the devil*; or that the *forbearing* to releaſe men from miſeries in which they became involved by no crime of their own, can upon any conſideration whatever, be made reconcileable with our uſual ideas of infinite goodneſs, mercy, and juſtice.

APPLICATION 3.

From a ſuppoſed pre-exiſtence, and prior *lapſe* of human ſouls, we are enabled to form a proper judgment of the controverted doctrine of *election* and *reprobation*, and to account for the preſent non *univerſality* of the *Chriſtian faith*.

§ 24. Thoſe paſſages in ſcripture, on which is grounded the doctrine of election and reprobation, viz.—*Many are called, but few are choſen*—and—*as many as the Lord our God ſhall call*, &c. when view'd through that medium are to me a demonſtration, that there is ſomething more in the doctrine of *election* and *reprobation*, than is generally apprehended.

§ 25. For though the great work of redemption, will, as we may reaſonably hope, become *univerſal* at laſt, yet it is evident from ſcripture, that God means to have it *gradually* accompliſhed, by a *partial* election, and *temporary* rejection of men lying under the guilt of a pre-exiſtent apoſtacy. And as all the ſeed of Abraham were not the children of promiſe.—*As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Eſau have I hated* —ſo neither were all the ſons of Adam meant to be partakers HERE, of the benefits of the goſpel diſpenſation. "*As many as thou gaveſt me*," ſays our Saviour, "*I have kept.*" But though *many* were *called*, yet but *few* were *choſen*. And in this, it is plain there was no *unrighteouſneſs* with God; when we conſider that all had ſo ſinned in a *prior* ſtate, as to have forfeited their Maker's favour in a greater or leſs degree, in proportion to the meaſure of their reſpective demerits. And therefore providence had wiſely ordered that the moſt abandoned of the fallen race, ſhould for a time ſit in darkneſs and the ſhadow

ſhadow of death, that others, more *deſerving* of the divine clemency, ſhould behold with a proportioned gratitude, that day—ſpring from on high that has viſited *us*. And *thus* a ſeeming *partiality* in divine providence *here* is perfect *equity*. *Thus* may God have *mercy on whom He will have mercy*, and whom he will he may *juſtly* harden. *Thus* hath the *potter* a *juſt* power over the *clay of the ſame lump*, to make one *veſſel unto honour*, and *another unto diſhonour*. For what if *God willing to ſhew his wrath*, and to make his *power be known, endured with much long-ſuffering, the veſſels of wrath fitted to deſtruction*; that he might make known the *riches of his glory* on the *veſſels of mercy*, which he had *afore prepared unto glory?* In other words, what if God, out of a *world lying in wickedneſs, children of wrath*, on account of a *prior* contempt of his power, and authority, and under vaſſalage to his rival the prince of devils, ſhould *elect*, for a reſtoration to his favour, upon the goſpel terms, whom he ſhould find moſt *deſerving* of that *partiality* (which is in reality, no partiality at all, but conſiſtent equity;) reſerving for ſome *future* trials of obedience, the more *notorious* offenders *? And if there has been hitherto ſuch a *partial* diſplay of the light of the goſpel and from the want of it in the *ſavage parts* of the world, there has appeared ſuch a number of *demi-devils* in the likeneſs of *men*, who ſees not that God purpoſely ſet *thoſe* to view, as the *ruins* of original righteouſneſs, and as ſucceſſive memento's of the miſeries ariſing from their prior apoſtacy?

---

* But this is a ſubject which will be more fully conſidered in a Treatiſe on Predeſtination and Future Puniſhments, already prepared for the preſs, and to be publiſhed ſoon.

§ 26. In

§ 26. In this ſatisfactory light, does the ſcripture doctrine, of election and reprobation (which reſpects the goſpel diſpenſation *only**,) and the *preſent* want of an univerſality of the Chriſtian faith appear, when view'd through the medium of a lapſe of human ſouls in a pre-exiſtent ſtate.

APPLICATION 4.

Through the medium of a pre-exiſtence, and prior *lapſe* of human ſouls, we are enabled to ſee into the propriety of the nature and circumſtances of the Jewiſh theocracy.

§ 27. The Almighty ſelected from the reſt of the world, took under his immediate protection, and ſhowered down perpetual bleſſings on--whom? Why on a people remarkable for their impiety, rebellion, and every ſpecies of ingratitude. And were theſe a people in whoſe favour the Almighty could with propriety intereſt himſelf in ſo *peculiar* a manner—Wretches daily meriting his deteſtation and abhorrence? Yes. For their demerits *only* they were *ſo* ſelected from the reſt of the world, were *ſo* highly favoured, benefited, careſſed and honoured. For what more ſuitable method could the Almighty take to exhibit to *after* ages, a view of nature lapſed from original righteouſneſs? What more ſtriking picture could be given of man in his natural unregenerate *unchriſtianized* frame? And what could afford a ſtronger argument in proof of the *expediency* and *neceſſity* of the *renovating* aids of the *Chriſtian* diſpenſation?

§ 28. Every inſtance of divine favour, was a tacit appeal to the *heart* of each Jew, and a trial of his piety and gratitude. And as *preſent* rewards

* I mean it relates *only* to the *calling ſome* to, and *withholding others* from, the knowledge and advantages of that goſpel.

uſually

uſually operate with more force than ſuch as are in reverſion, the former were the promiſed recompence for their obedience---and thoſe *only*. With theſe they were ſatisfied—they were ſolicitous for nothing more—future rewards were out of the queſtion—the *Moſaic Covenant* promiſed *none*, (as the learned author of the divine legation of Moſes with great truth affirms) nor did they *engage* for the obſervance of that *covenant*, on any *promiſe* of *rewards in a future ſtate*.

§ 29. Again, the *law*, as ſays the apoſtle, was given by Moſes, but *grace and truth* came by Jeſus Chriſt. The *law* was given to the Jews to try what they would, or rather to ſhew, what, *perſonally* lapſed as they were from original righteouſneſs, they could *not* do. And that *grace*, from the want of which, they were unable to act up to an obſervance even of laws to which were annexed *preſent* rewards, that *grace* to which, as *prior* delinquents, they had forfeited all kind of claim, came, with no injuſtice to them, by Jeſus Chriſt *only*.

§ 30. When again we conſider that the *nations round about them*, were devoting themſelves afreſh to the worſhip and ſervice of the rival of the Almighty's authority, and renewing thoſe engagements with him on earth, which they had ſo cordially fulfilled before in Heaven, who does not ſee into the propriety of the Almighty's proceeding in occaſionally holding *them* forth *here* as objects of his wrath indignation and *exterminating* vengeance? Eſpecially when no doubt can reaſonably be made but that even thoſe who for ſufficient reaſons were conſidered as objects of meer *juſtice* only for a ſeaſon, will in the fulneſs of time become objects of his *mercy* and *compaſſion*.

APPLICATION 5.

The means for obtaining *juſtification*, and *ſalvation* are aſcertained by an application of the doctrine of a pre-exiſtence, and prior *lapſe* of human ſouls.

§ 31. Is it not the language of ſcripture, that, during our *unregeneracy here* we are in a ſtate of continued enmity and rebellion againſt God; ſtill a kind of liege ſubjects to the prince of the apoſtate powers? Is it not at the ſame Time equally evident, that God, in his wrath, thinketh upon mercy, that he is *in Chriſt reconciling the world unto himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes——that they may be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God*; that we may receive *the free gift of many offences unto juſtification——being juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus?*

§ 32. And what are the conditions on our part, required by the goſpel diſpenſation, to ſecure to us the mighty bleſſing? Is there not, in reality only *one*, and that an actual, cordial, unreſerved *faith in Chriſt* *? Moſt aſſuredly yes. Did not God ſo love the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever *believeth* in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life? John iii. 16. Are not the actions of our Saviour recorded——that we might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that *believing*, we might have life through his Name? John xx. 31. And what

* I mean that belief in Jeſus Chriſt, which conſiſts in a firm fidelity to him, as our mediator and redeemer.

ſays

ſays the apoſtle to the Romans? If thou ſhalt confeſs, ſays he, with thy mouth, the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt *believe* in thine heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved. Rom. x. 9. And, again---*By the deeds of the law*, ſays he, *there ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his ſight.*

But now the *righteouſneſs of God without the law* is manifeſted, *being witneſſed by the law and prophets*; even the righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith of (in) Jeſus Chriſt unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference.

For all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God, being juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.

Whom God hath ſet forth (or as the marginal reading rightly words it, *foreordained)* to be a propitiation through *faith in his blood*, to declare his righteouſneſs for the remiſſion of ſins, that are paſt, through the forbearance of God.

To declare, I ſay, his righteouſneſs, that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus.

Now, can any thing be more plainly the ſenſe of the preceding paſſages, than that we are *juſtified*, or cleared from the guilt of original ſin, reſtored to the forfeited favour and affection of God, and reſcued from the power and dominion of ſin and ſatan, by a true faith in Chriſt *only?* Is there a ſingle word throughout, about *works?* Not a ſyllable. And how inefficacious *they* are, and muſt be, for the effecting that *juſtification* to which the apoſtle alludes, which is the ſubject of the goſpel œconomy, and the very *price of our redemption*, we perceive through the medium of a pre-exiſtence, and prior *lapſe* of human ſouls with

a clearneſs that cannot but ſtrike conviction upon the moſt partial and unwilling eye.

§ 33. The new or mediatorial œconomy, eſtabliſhed by the author of our ſalvation, is frequently ſtiled in ſcripture, the kingdom *of God*, and that partly, if not principally, in contradiſtinction to the kingdom of *ſatan*. This is plainly intimated by our Saviour's anſwer to his enemies who traduced him as an impoſtor, and as one who was in confederacy with *Beelzebub*, the prince of devils. *If ſatan*, ſays he, *caſt out ſatan, he is divided againſt himſelf; how then ſhall his kingdom ſtand?*

But If I caſt out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Matt. xii. 26. 28.

In which paſſage Chriſt and ſatan are repreſented as rival princes, poſſeſſed of kingdoms inconſiſtent with, and deſtructive of each other.

To the ſame purpoſe is that parable in St. *Luke*, of a ſtrong man in his palace overcome by a ſtronger than he. Luke xi. 21, 22, And that other wherein the kingdom of heaven is likened to a man, that ſowed good ſeed in the field, but while he ſlept, his enemy came, and ſowed tares among the wheat. Matt. xiii. 24. &c. Agreeably to all which St. Paul obſerves to the Corinthians, that there is no concord betwixt *Chriſt* and *Belial*.

§ 34. If to the paſſages above we add St. *John*'s declaration, that for this purpoſe the Son of God was manifeſted, that he might deſtroy the works of the devil, and, that St. *Paul* ſuppoſes *all* men in general, in their *natural unregenerate* ſtate I mean, to walk according to the *prince of the power of the air*—Vid. my critique on Epheſians, c. ii. v. 2. 3.---It will appear that he who is our *Redeemer* comes with the delegated authority *of a king*, to aſſert his Father's right

right to an uncontrouled, unoppoſed ſovereignty over the univerſe; to pull down, and evacuate the uſurped empire of the devil in this inferior world, and to reſcue mankind from his oppreſſion, by turning them from darkneſs to light, and from the power of ſatan unto God—and *that* by offering them peace with their offended God, and pardon for that paſt *aſſociation* with the prince of darkneſs, which we have above ſuppoſed, on the ſtipulated conditions of a ſincere, unſhaken *fidelity* to Him, the appointed captain of our ſalvation.

§ 35. Till therefore, we have diſavowed our *attachment* to the prince of darkneſs, and ſworn allegiance to the Lord of life, there ſtill hangs over our heads, for our *prior* diſloyalty, the rod of vengeance; ſtill we are objects of the divine wrath; and be our *moral* accompliſhments ever ſo many, and great, we are, and muſt be upon the liſt of rebels ſtill. Our *attainder* muſt be taken off, ere we can be made candidates for an entrance into Chriſt's kingdom. And in that conſiſts our *juſtification*; which replaceth us before the eye of the Deity, in the ſame favourable and auſpicious point of view, wherein we ſtood, when poſſeſſed of that original righteouſneſs, and moral rectitude, by a departure from which we became rebels to the king of heaven; and, in conſequence thereof, are now baniſhed his divine preſence. Herein conſiſts that righteouſneſs of God, which is—by what? By *good works?* Is it not by *faith of Jeſus Chriſt unto all, and upon all them that believe?* And our *juſtification*—is it in the leaſt degree effected by the merit of *good works?* is it not accompliſhed wholly, and ſolely through *the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus*, and through faith in his blood? Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's

elect? It is God that juſtifieth*; who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt, that died, yea rather, that is riſen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who alſo maketh interceſſion for us.

§ 36. Juſtification therefore, being ſuppoſed to reſpect that defilement of our nature and rebellion againſt God, with which we come into this world, and which is now our *condemnation*; is it poſſible that any *preſent*, or *future* acts of purity, piety, and obedience in us, can render that condemnation for *prior* acts of impiety no condemnation. Can all the ſorrowful ſighings of priſoners, under ſentence of death for rebellion againſt a temporal king, any ſuitable, decent, amiable acts *then* take away the guilt of thoſe *prior* crimes, for which they forfeited their lives? If they are pardoned, and reſtored afterwards to their prince's favour, by the interceſſion of his Son pledging *his* life for their future fidelity, need we aſk to whom they are indebted both for *their* life and liberty? Come they not from the free grace of the one, and thro' the mediation, and interceſſion of the other? Could the criminals plead, with any ſhew of reaſon, from any *ſubſequent* deeds, a *right* to be exempted from the puniſhment due to their *paſt* criminalities?

§ 37. Juſtification, conſidered in this view, as a releaſe, I mean, from the guilt of a *prior perſonal* lapſe from original righteouſneſs, inſtead of a *derived* guilt and defilement from Adam, exalts—how greatly! the dignity and merit aſcribed in ſcripture to a true faith in Chriſt at the ſame time that it enables us the more clearly

---

* That is, who through Chriſt, *accepts* us as juſt, by our faith and reliance on *his* mediation, interceſſion, &c.

to

to adjudge to *faith* and *good works* the regards due to their reſpective efficacy in accompliſhing man's *final* ſalvation.

§ 38. The two apoſtles differed in that point only in appearance; and whilſt the one, with great truth, aſſerted, that the works of the law ceaſed to have any ſhare in the *juſtification* of the elect *chriſtianized* Jew, ſo circumſtanced, and ſo conſidered; the other with equal propriety declared, that faith *alone* could not render *worthy of the vocation wherewith he was called*, the *converted* Gentile. Men muſt become *Chriſtians* to be juſtified, or cleared from the imputation of their original ſins and treſpaſſes, and to be *conſiſtent* Chriſtians, they muſt become *good men*. How apparently then is *faith* in Chriſt *alone* neceſſary for the firſt, and how evidently eſſential are *good works* for the latter? And how conſiſtent altogether with each other are the two apoſtles*! And if there are ſome who ſay

---

* How conſiſtent altogether with each other are the two apoſtles—To clear up this point, be pleaſed to attend to the following note.

Introductory to the *final* ſtate of bliſs, reſerved for the *ſincere* profeſſors of Chriſtianity, will be an entrance into *Chriſt's kingdom*; the two prime fundamental requiſites for which privilege are *juſtification* and *ſanctification* —or true holineſs. By the former we are to underſtand an *abſolution* from the penalty of original guilt and defilement, obtained wholely and ſolely by a firm faith in, or reliance on the all-ſufficient merits of Chriſt, who died for our ſins, and roſe again for our juſtification. By the latter, that acquiſition of moral purity and holineſs, which the goſpel enjoins, and without which, the apoſtle informs us, no man ſhall ſee the Lord.

This being admitted, the perplexed diſpute, whether faith with or without works can be available to our *juſtification*, drops at once, as the queſtion ſhould rather be, whether they are ſeparately effectual to our *ſalvation*, or not? As to this, there

ſay that all our *moral* works, independent of *Chriſtian renovation*, are unavailable to *juſtification*, or to clear us from *original* ſin, how apparently do they ſpeak a ſcripture doctrine? What they err in, is their aſcribing that original guilt, by which at our birth we became objects of the divine wrath and indignation to the tranſgreſſion of another

---

there can be no *rational* diſpute. That we are *juſtified*, i. e. cleanſed from the guilt of original ſin by a firm faith in Chriſt, independent of any merit in ourſelves, or of good works, we have reiterated declarations from holy writ; but then, in order to render that *juſtification* effectual to our *final ſalvation*, introductory to which will be an entrance into Chriſt's kingdom *(a)*, we muſt add to our faith works—muſt walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called—muſt cleanſe ourſelves from all filthineſs of the fleſh and the ſpirit, perfecting holineſs in the fear of God—knowing this, that without a true goſpel repentance, added to the applied merits of our Saviour, neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterors, nor effeminate, nor abuſers of themſelves with mankind, nor railers, nor extortioners, ſhall enter into the kingdom of God. Men, in ſhort, are wont to place *juſtification* and man's final *ſalvation* in one and the ſame point of view, as if they were in reality one and the ſame thing, or that the one naturally, and of neceſſity, lead to the other; which is not the caſe. For the apoſtle St. Paul, plainly ſuppoſes, that thoſe who have been once enlightened--απαξ φωτισθεντας —have embraced the chriſtian faith—obtaining thereby a juſtification from original ſin, and had taſted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt—He ſuppoſes, I ſay, that ſuch may fall back into perdition.

In ſhort, *juſtification*, which conſiſts in a releaſe from our original (pre exiſtent) guilt and defilement, and without which we cannot become *candidates* for that kingdom of God and of Chriſt, through which we are to paſs to our *final* ſtate of happineſs, is obtained by a faith in Chriſt *only*; but an *actual entrance* into that kingdom is attainable only by our adding to that faith *good works*, or good *deſires*, and good *endeavours* at leaſt towards good works.

(a) The nature of that kingdom will be conſidered in my treatiſe on predeſtination and future puniſhments.

perſon

perſon—to fallen Adam; which can with no degree of propriety, nor with any warrantable conceptions of the divine attributes, if even without blaſphemy, be aſcribed to aught elſe, but to our own *perſonal* treſpaſſes in a *prior* ſtate. And all this error of theirs is grounded entirely on a wrong conſtruction of the two following paſſages in St. *Paul*'s epiſtles. " As " by one man's diſobedience many were made " ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many " be made righteous. " As in Adam all die, " even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.

For an explication of which paſſage, I muſt refer the reader to a note below*.

§ 39. Is

* That *condemnation* to death, which God paſſed upon Adam for his diſobedience, became *hereditary* to his whole offspring, and would have been *fixed*, and *irreverſible*, but that—— *As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive*,—ſhall, by the all-ſufficient merits of him who died for our ſins, and roſe again for our juſtification, through faith in his blood, and the added efficacy of a well-ſpent life, riſe to the life immortal, enter into the joy of our lord, and be reſtored at length to the favour of God, which we had forfeited by our *prior* perſonal treſpaſſes, and ſins, and on account of which we were made *ſharers* in the penalty inflicted on Adam, viz. death.

Agreeably to which, ſays the apoſtle, " As by the offence " of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, " even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one, the free gift came " upon all men unto juſtification of life.

" For as by one man's diſobedience many were made ſin- " ners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made " righteous."

The apoſtle's meaning in theſe paſſages will ſufficiently appear, by attending to the force of the aſſertion, in the words —*By the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous.*

Here—to be made righteous evidently ſignifies, to be treated, and dealt with as, or placed in the light of (*a*) righteous

(*a*) Κατεςαθησαν conſtituti ſunt. When God is repreſented as ſaying, " Let us *make* man in our image." Gen. i. 26. the word made uſe of by the LXX is ποιησωμεν.

§ 39. Is it credible the miſeries of our natural unregenerate ſtate, not the loſs of God's favour only,

---

ous perſons, though actual offenders at the ſame time. For the Son of God having, while here on earth, fulfilled all righteouſneſs (of which the moſt eminent and meritorious inſtance was, his becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the croſs, in compliance with his Father's will, and in order to accompliſh the redemption of mankind) God the Father was pleaſed to impute this *perfect* obedience of that *one* man, the *ſecond Adam*, to the whole race of mankind, as an atonement for all their *prior* treſpaſſes; as compleat, and ſatisfactory to his juſtice, as if they had fulfilled *all righteouſneſs* by ſome perſonal merit in themſelves. Thus, I ſay, and thus only it is true, that, *by the obedience of one many were made righteous*. And as this bears an analogical reference to what is aſſerted in the words immediately preceding, viz. that *by one man's diſobedience many were made ſinners*, the ſame *figurative* interpretation muſt of courſe be put on both. When the apoſtle therefore ſays, that—"by one man's diſ- "obedience many were made ſinners," he undoubtedly means, that God was pleaſed ſo far to impute the tranſgreſſion of that one man, the *firſt Adam*, to his whole poſterity, as to *deal* with them univerſally in ſuch a manner, as if they had all been *partakers* with him in the very act (*a*). And the reaſon *why* God proceeded againſt them in a manner ſo ſeemingly *rigorous, and unreaſonable*, the apoſtle had given in the following words.

Wherefore as by one man ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin, even ſo death paſſed upon all men, for that, *or* becauſe that *all had* [ημαρτον] *ſinned* (*b*).

(*a*) To be made ſin, and to be made ſinners, we may conſider *as ſynonimous expreſſions*; therefore, if to be made ſinners, means here the transferring *the guilt* of Adam's ſin to us, ſo as upon that very account we become obnoxious to the *wrath of God*, who can ſay, that in the bleſſed Jeſus there *was no ſin*, ſince he was *made ſin* for us?

(*b*) That ημαρτον refers to ſins independent of and prior to Adam's tranſgreſſion *here*, the apoſtle evinces, by obſerving, in the next verſe but one—that death (the conſequence of ſin) reigned *even over them*, that had not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion—και επι τους μη αμαρτησαντας επι τω ομοιωματι της παραβασεως Αδαμ. But if we ſuppoſe the word

ημαρτον

an actual exertion of his wrath and indignation upon us, our alienation from God and goodneſs, and propenſity to vice and impiety, added to the multiplied calamities of a world; which taking in all its fancied excellencies and advantages, its riches and honours, and powers, and pre-eminences, and glittering glories, is at beſt but a fool's paradiſe—That ſuch ſhould be the wretched condition of man, and merely in conſequence of a crime that he had it not in his power either to commit or prevent; is this, I ſay, credible? Is it poſſible * ?

§ 40. And when it is further aſſerted, that nothing leſs than the blood of the Son of God could atone for, or waſh away the ſtain of this *imputed* guilt, who but muſt fire with pious indignation at ſuch an impious outrage upon human underſtanding? And how neceſſary is it, as we

---

ημαρτον to refer to crimes not *prior*, but *ſubſequent* to the ſentence paſſed upon Adam's tranſgreſſion, viz. our *perſonal* tranſgreſſions here, the apoſtle's aſſertion is manifeſtly this, viz.

Death paſſed upon all men on account of Adam's ſin *becauſe* all have ſinned *ſince*.

Τις ημαρτεν ουτος η οι γονεις αυτου ινα τυφλος γεννηθη—ſay the Jews to our Saviour:—in our Engliſh tranſlation thus; who did ſin, this Man, or his parents, that he was born blind? The ſenſe of which queſtion manifeſtly is, who *had* ſinned, this man, or, &c. Now ημαρτον in the *preceding* paſſage, being of the ſame tenſe with ημαρτεν in this παντες ημαρτον may, and muſt with critical propriety be rendered—all *had* ſinned.

* The trivial argument, that God had provided, or preordained a Redeemer, in favour of thoſe who ſhould be involved in the ruinous effects of Adam's fall, ſo far from being a rational appeal to our underſtandings, is on the contrary a barefaced inſult upon common ſenſe. Juſt as if a king ſhould condemn a man to death for *another* perſon's crime, in order that he might ſhew his *mercy* afterwards in giving the *imaginary* offender life.

value the credit, and would wiſh the moſt extenſive propagation of the goſpel, to clear the ſacred pages from the charge of advancing a doctrine ſo abhorrent to reaſon and calm reflection! This only can enable us to convince unbelievers, that Chriſtianity is in reality *founded on argument*; then, and not till then, ſhall we be able to approve our faith to the underſtanding of the rational enquirer, and free-thinker. And had this been done before, the *Tindal's*, *Collins's*, *Woolſton's*, *Chubb's*, *Bolingbroke's*, would not have had ſo fair a mark whereat to ſhoot ſo plentifully (and with ſo many palpable hits at the ſame time) their *arrows*—even *bitter words.*

§ 41. The chevalier Ramſay, in ſpeaking of the ſuppoſed guilt derived from Adam--adds--" Atrocious Maxim that ſullies all the conduct of providence, and that ſhocks the underſtanding of the moſt intelligent *children* of all nations! the anſwers ordinarily made to them, throw into their tender minds the ſeeds of a latent incredulity, and of this I could give many fatal examples, if this were the proper place for it. I ſhall content myſelf with one. A great Prince, ſays he, of a neighbouring nation, equally admired for his ſuperior genius, univerſal learning, and ſurprizing talents in political and military affairs, but who lived and died in the moſt obſtinate incredulity, being one day aſked after a long, ſerious and familiar converſation with a friend, what had inſpired him with ſuch invincible prejudices againſt revealed religion; he anſwered, he had imbibed them early, yea even from his childhood when he learned his catechiſm. He ſaid his preceptor having entertained him a long time with the ſtory of the forbidden fruit, and the *imputation of Adam's ſin to all his poſterity*, he aſked how a good *God* could condemn all the human race for the

the fault of one man, in whoſe crime they had never co-operated, and whoſe perſon they had never ſeen? The tutor embarraſed, made him the common childiſh anſwer of the ſchoolmen. Theſe inſipid replies augmenting rather than diminiſhing the difficulties, my tender mind, continued the prince, was ſtruck with horror upon every new repetition of that inſipid ſtuff; as I grew up, this ſacred horror changed by degrees into a ſhrewd ſuſpicion, and turned at laſt into a total contempt of a religion that was founded upon ſuch a blaſphemous tenet. The ſame prince added, that, puſhed by his general curioſity for ſciences of all kind, he had looked into the ſcholaſtic theology, and that he had never found any book ſo proper to nouriſh in him *deiſm and incredulity*, as the account they give of religion. "And I defy any man to read, ſays Ramſey, our vulgar catechiſms on this point, with a ſprightly ſmart ſchool-boy, and hint to him its abſurdity, without the child's being ſtruck with the ſame impreſſions as the great prince mentioned."

APPLICATION 6.

From the doctrine of a pre-exiſtence, &c. of human ſouls, there ariſes an additional argument in proof of that life and immortality ſo happily brought to light by the goſpel.

§ 42. The idea of the ſoul's being immortal from time paſt, ſtrengthens our hopes of its being ſo for time to come. We may from thence with no ſmall degree of probability infer, that there are in its nature and eſſence, the ſeeds of immortality. From a *view* however of the ſoul in a contrary light, as not having experienced thought, and of courſe a vital exiſtence previous to its *en-*

trance into this ſtate, a *royal* author concludes, that ſuch will be its fate at its *departure* from it.

De l'avenir, cher Keith, Jougeons par le paſsé
Comment avant que je fuſſe, il n'avoit point pensé,
De même apres ma Mort, quand toutes mes parties,
Par la coruption ſeront anneanties,
Par un même deſtin il ne penſera plus;
Non-rien n' eſt plus certain ſoyons--en convaincus,
Dès que nous finiſſons, notre ame eſt eclipſeé:
Elle eſt en tout ſemblable a la flamme élanceé,
Qui part du Bois ardent dont elle ſe nourrit,
Et d'es qu'il tombe en Cendre elle baiſſe et perit.*

Of which the following contains the ſenſe, tho' not I fear the ſpirit.

From what is paſt, dear Keith, learn what's to come;
Thought *I had* none, *till iſſuing from the womb.*
By the ſame law of fate, when death's cold dart
Shall chill the vital powers, and every part
Of this precarious fabric, ſhall be brought
To diſſolution, then adieu to thought.----
Yes, reſt aſſur'd, when here *we ceaſe to live,*
The ſoul makes no pretenſion to ſurvive—
Alike relinquiſhing its mortal frame,
As quits th' enkindled BRAND *the lambent flame;*
Which gives, the ember falling to decay,
A faint and fainter light, then—dies away.

But the royal author himſelf muſt ſurely wiſh to reverſe his own propoſition for the ſake of this reverſe and more comfortable *concluſion* which by a parity of reaſon flows from it.

From what is paſt we learn what is to be,
From pre-exiſtence— immortality.
As to a prior *life we died, 'tis plain,*
When next *we die, 'twill be to* live *again.*

* Oeuvres du Philoſophe du ſans ſouci, tom. 2. p. 143.

§ 43. In

§4 3. The royal author of *Oeuvres du Philoſophe*, &c. has indeed exerted his ſpeculative and poetic talents with a ſhare of ſucceſs, equal to what might be expected from his extraordinary abilities. The arguments thrown out, as above and elſewhere in ſupport of Lucretian and other ſceptic principles, I conſider rather as occaſional efforts of genius and imagination than ſpecimens of his *real* ſentiments. For can the royal Hero, after having experienced ſuch an almoſt unparallell'd ſeries of hair-breadths eſcape from ſurrounding deſtruction, and leadings to victory and glory equally amazing, imagine that for the *deſtruction* of fellow-*ſouls* only *, an hidden SOMEWHAT ſo watchfully and ſo effectually interpoſed in his favour? Or is it poſſible that, contenting himſelf with the hopes of a *ſhadowy* immortality in the annals of *fame*, he ſhould endeavour to reaſon himſelf out of all deſire of aſcending with encreaſing glory to a *real* immortality? The P—n M——h poſſeſſes a ſoul too enlarged I am perſuaded to contract his views within the HORIZON of this MOLEHILL, in the infinity of worlds, and unconcernedly to aſſign to CORRUPTION that active and exalted principle to which he owes all his more than ordinary dignity, as a man, a hero, and a king. Can the royal author in ſhort help reaſoning with himſelf as thus?——

The mind that knows etherial worlds to trace,
Sees by what laws athwart the boundleſs ſpace
Of Heaven's domain huge comets wond'rous roll,
Their fires dilate; how various ſuns controul
Revolving planets, ſtars unmov'd convey
To darkſome orbs the bright enliv'ning ray—
Say—ſhall that pure pervading ſpirit eye
All nature through th' immeaſurable ſkie,

* *Aime* baiſſe et *perit.*—See above.

Nor

Nor once where first *ſhe learn't to live and love,*
Not once reviſit *thoſe bleſs'd realms above!*
Abſurd! Mark how the ſubtile mental flame,
Emits pow'rs active, *Matter dares not claim!*
Self-conſcious, ſelf-empower'd to think, to chuſe,
Rejoice, grieve, hope, fear, love, hate, will, refuſe.
Great in herſelf, and ſcorning matter's aid,
She views, compares, digeſts; in darkneſs laid,
The truth unform'd, and which in embryo ſleeps,
She quickens, ſhapes, and in juſt order keeps;
'Twixt that *and* error *fixes the barrier,*
" For ever ſep'rate, and for ever near."
Of things their cauſes next diſtinct eſpies;
Hence arts on arts in beauteous order riſe;
Till more and more progreſſive in its ſearch,
It kens, contemplates, touches Heav'ns high arch;
Connects the links, which diff'rent worlds unite,
From higheſt Angels to the reptile mite;
Then drops into herſelf, and plenteous there,
Views in idea all things as they are;
Broods o'er the deep of thought—knows all but this—
*Her awful wond'rous ſelf—whence—*what *ſhe is,*
And lodge ſuch virtues in meer ſenſeleſs clay?
Knows the MACHINE *by whom it's taught to play?*
By whom firſt bid to move?—Say, Atheiſts, ſay.
Ceaſe then to wonder ſoul's *hereafter live,*
This frail this mould'ring tenement ſurvive;
Much rather ſay the ſafer doubt will lie,
Whether 'tis poſſible the ſoul can *die—*
One individual (no parts conjoin'd)
A pure, etherial, ſelf-directing mind,
Which nought external can affect, annoy,
Corrupt, impair, diſturb, debaſe, deſtroy.
Itſelf its mover ſole, ſay, by what art
Shall it e'er ſep'rate?—from its ſelf depart!
This ſcene of line contemplate if you can,
With joy and vindicate the ways of God to man,

If

If here it ſhuts—No—See the coming day,
When clouds and darkneſſes will fly away—
Vain is that hope?---Then e'en diſclaim thy God,
Say all are fools who fear'd his threat'ning rod.
Ne'er from the ways of Heaven a God infer---
A God who ſo egreg'ouſly can err.
Ah no! be calm---expect (tho' how *or* when
It matters not) when all ſhall live again;
When Heav'n to truth ſhall ſhew its fond regard,
And give to good and bad the due reward.*

APPLICATION 7.

The goſpel diſpenſation in general, and the mediatorial œconomy in particular, is more likely to attract the attention, and gain the belief of the *rational* free thinker and enquirer when grounded on a ſuppoſed pre-exiſtence and prior *lapſe* of human ſouls, than when founded on an imagined guilt derived from Adam.

§ 44. How amiable and exalted, how worthy of all acceptation is the mediatorial œconomy, when grounded on the former hypotheſis! What can we conceive more worthy a God of infinite wiſdom, goodneſs and mercy, than by means ſuitable to his dignity and glory, to call back to his love, his favour, his protection, creatures beguiled into diſloyalty and diſobedience by an artful, ambitious, enterpriſing rival of his power and authority! And how engaging, and endearing muſt be that love which ſo benevolently interpoſed to effectuate the compaſſionate deſign! "How "worthy the lamb that was ſlain to receive pow-"er and riches, and wiſdom and ſtrength and

* The above is a tranſlation of a part of Mr. *Brown's Poem De Animi Immortalitate*—I wiſh it equalled the elegant original.

honour,

honour, and glory, and bleſſing," for ſo noble ſo exalted a purpoſe as this---for *thus* coming into the world to ſave ſinners! " to preach good tid-
" ings unto the meek, to bind up the broken-
" hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and
" opening of the priſon to them that are bound," Iſa. lxi. 1. to be made an " offering for ſin," for that original, pre-exiſtent ſin, by which we forfeited the favour of God,—" to give his life a
" ranſom for all"—to be a propitiation for our
" ſins, and to make *reconciliation* with *God* for
" them," by ſharing in the multiplied miſeries and calamities of human nature, without having been a partaker of that original guilt from which they enſued. " He was cut off, but not
" for himſelf, Dan. ix. 26. he was wounded for
" our tranſgreſſions, and bruiſed for our impie-
" ties," Iſa. liii. 5—was made a ſin, and a curſe for us, 2 Cor. v. 21. Galat. iii. 13. died for the ungodly, " ſuffered for the unjuſt," 1 Pet. iii. 18.—" taſted death for every man," Heb. ii. 9. —" that through death he might deſtroy him
" that had the power of death, that is, the de-
" vil, * and deliver them, who through fear of
" death were all their life-time in bondage," Heb. ii. that he might " finiſh tranſgreſſion and
" make an end of ſin," † that he might " make
" reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in ever-
" laſting righteouſneſs." Dan. ix. 24. Hence it is that he became a " full, perfect, and ſufficient
" ſacrifice, oblation, and ſatisfaction, for the ſins

* The prince of the fallen angels,——the God of this world; He to whom we are, by nature, (in conſequence of our prior aſſociation with him) *his* children, ſervants, and ſubjects.

† *To make an end of ſin*,—that is to make an end of the *guilt*, and *puniſhment* of ſin, of *original* ſin, moſt undoubtedly; for " ſin ſtill reigns in our mortal bodies," and " there is
none yet, that doth good, no not one."

of

of the whole world." Hence it is, that the " chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him, and " with his ſtripes we were healed, Iſa. liii. 5--- that we are reconciled to the Father in his croſs, " and in the body of his fleſh through death," Col. i. 21, 22---" are ſanctified by the offering " of his body once for all," Heb. x. 10. are redeemed by his blood, as of a lamb without blemiſh, and " without ſpot." 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.--- Hence laſtly it is, that Chriſt " is the mediator " of the New Teſtament" and " that by means " of death for the redemption of the tranſgreſ- " ſions," (the original tranſgreſſions under, and unattoned for, or unexpiated by the firſt teſtament) " they which are called mighty receive the " promiſe of eternal inheritance," Heb. ix. 15. ---" the promiſe being made to all, that are afar " off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall " call." Acts ii. 39.

§ 45. And now is it poſſible for *deiſts* to behold, and not with raptures embrace Chriſtianity, when placed in ſo conſiſtent, ſo amiable a light? will they now think ſcorn of our faith, and treat it ſtill with their wonted contempt and deriſive blaſphemies? who will not now, on the contrary, glory in having been received into the *congregation of Chriſt's flock?* Who will now *be aſhamed to confeſs the faith of Chriſt crucified, manfully to fight under his banner, againſt ſin, the world and the devil, and to continue Chriſt's faithful ſoldier and ſervant unto his life's end?* I flatter myſelf that but few, if any, of that ſtamp, will be found, among thoſe I mean, who would be deemed men of reaſon, reflection, and ſelf-regard.

§ 46. The calm, the ſedate, the reflecting Sceptic will now find charms in religion, of which he had

no idea before; will, with an unuſual ſeriouſneſs, bethink himſelf of his ſtate and condition here---will be equally anxious to enquire, whence could ariſe, and by what means may be removed, thoſe intellectual depravities, and impurities, which debaſe him even in his own eyes, and from which reaſon, as well as ſcripture, agree it is neceſſary for him to be refined, and cleanſed, e'er it is poſſible for him to ſee God.

§ 47. Am I then a ſtranger, ſays he, and pilgrim upon earth, baniſhed from the preſence of my Maker, and from heaven, my native home? Were my tranſgreſſions in a prior ſtate the horrid cauſe of this dreadful calamity? Was it by means of them, that I now wear thoſe foul ſtains in my nature, by which my will and affections are corrupted, my underſtanding darkened and perplexed, and my whole mind debaſed, and degenerated from moral rectitude? For my pre-exiſtent apoſtacy from God is it, that I came into the world a creature *born in ſin*, by *nature a child of wrath?*---was it for rebellion againſt Him, that I am ſent hither under the power and dominion of *ſatan*, who ſeduced, as I am aſſured from ſcripture, a whole order of beings into ſin? Is it for this, that I bear about me this body of ſin, which is enmity againſt God, which is not ſubject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; which gives maintenance to ſuch an army of fleſhly luſts, that war againſt my ſoul?---And to reſtore me to the favour and affection of my offended God, to expiate the guilt of my paſt tranſgreſſions by his own imputed *righteouſneſs*, to renew in me that degree of it, wherein I was firſt created, to reſcue me from the dominion of my

firſt

firſt betrayer, and bring me again into the glorious liberty of the ſons of God.---Is it for this cauſe that the ſon of God was manifeſted? Are theſe thoſe works of the devil, that he came to deſtroy? Welcome then, my Saviour, my Redeemer! O thrice welcome to an entire ſurrender of my ſoul to thy word, thy will, and thy authority, thou captain of my ſalvation! O conduct me, thou highly favoured of heaven, to the mercy-ſeat of my offended Sovereign! O give me there to proſtrate myſelf before his injured Majeſty! Veil me from the countenance of him, that is againſt them, that do evil; ſhield me from his uplifted vengeance; under the ſhadow of thy wings hide me from his wrath---throw me, clad with righteouſneſs, into the arms of infinite mercy---into thy arms, oh my God!---And oh give me, O God, the comfort of thine help again, and eſtabliſh me with thy free ſpirit! So ſhall ſinners be converted unto thee, and men ſhall ſing of thy righteouſneſs. Caſt me not away from thy preſence, and let not thy jealouſy burn like fire for ever. And do thou, oh bleſſed Spirit, with thine all-healing, all-purifying influences on thy wing deſcend upon my ſoul, take an unrivalled poſſeſſion of my heart, make it a fit temple for thy abode, refine it from all its impurities, make it an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob---and I will fall low on my knees before his footſtool.

§ 48. Such muſt undoubtedly be the overflowings of an heart touched with a true ſenſe of religion, of the *true cauſe*, I mean of the wretchedneſs of man's abode here, and the deliverance propoſed to him by the mediatorial œconomy.

To

To thoſe who have *ſo learned Chriſt*, the goſpel comes in *the demonſtration of the ſpirit, and of power*—not in the words *which man's wiſdom teacheth*, but which *the holy* Ghoſt teacheth. May therefore, all thoſe, who as yet know *but in part*, and *ſee darkly as through a glaſs* the ſoul reviving comforts of Chriſtianity, have the *eyes of their underſtanding enlighten'd* by the gracious influence of the holy ſpirit--may that comfortleſs miſt which at preſent overſpreads the face of truth, which eclipſes the enrapturing brightneſs, and clouds with an *horrid* gloom the majeſty of the ſun of righteouſneſs and ſalvation, be at length ſo effectually removed that men may ſee *clearly* the glory that is revealed by the goſpel—may taſte and ſee how gracious the Lord is— that thy mercy, O Lord, *reacheth unto the heavens*, and *thy glory unto the clouds*.

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

AN extract from that part of *An account of* ORIGEN, *and his Opinion*, (vid. p. 23) which relates to pre-exiſtence.

ARGU. 1. The nature of the ſoul is ſuch as makes her capable of exiſting eternally *backward* as well as *forward*. For her ſpiritual eſſence as ſuch makes it impoſſible that ſhe ſhould either through age or violence be diſſolv'd part from part, as it happens in bodies, where there is no *vinculum* paſſing through the very ſubſtance of them to tye and retain one part to another; and therefore either through the ſtiller inſinuation of other bodies near them they inſenſibly melt away and decay, or by the ruder daſhes of ſuch as ſtrike againſt them are broken all to pieces: whereas the ſoul, as a *Spirit*, by the advantage of that *formal* power and property of hers whereby ſhe is diſtinguiſh'd from matter, cannot only *penetrate* herſelf and other ſubſtances to the preſerving her own *continuity*; but alſo by her *gradual derivation* of part from part is in her whole ſubſtance ultimately connected to her *indiviſible head* and *centre*, as *Plotinus* ſpeaks. Which *centre* being in its very *ſubſtance* intellectual does plainly ſhew who is the Father of it, viz. the *Eſſential mind* and *wiſdom* of God, whoſe univocal productions (as I may ſo ſpeak) are according to their meaſure and capacity what their parent is in the moſt perfect and moſt infinite degree conceivable, *Life it ſelf*, or *eternal Life*, and therefore thoſe other parts of the ſubſtance of the ſoul which neceſſarily proceed and flow from this, can no more be cut off from it than *indiviſible* can be divided, nor no more periſh than *Life it ſelf* can die*.

* This argument is copiouſly and clearly illuſtrated in the writings of Dr. Henry Moore, and Mr. Glanville.

We have then here an *Eſſence* capable of eternal exiſtence: and ſince the powers and operations of life are not ſuch things as can at pleaſure be put on and off like looſe-hanging *Adjuncts*, but are intrinſically made up into the eſſential contexture of the ſubſtance they are in; ſo vital and active a ſubſtance as the ſoul is, is as capable of acting according to her nature, and conſequently of feeling and enjoying the pleaſure of her life and actions from eternal ages, as ſhe is of bare exiſtence throughout that long period of duration: So that nothing now is wanting to her actual exiſtence but his good pleaſure from whom ſhe and all things elſe proceed. I appeal therefore to your own candid breaſt, and that noble benignity of mind which is in you, what reaſon or cauſe can you think of worthy of God, which will manifeſtly aſſure us that the ſoul did not actually exiſt of old? If you pitch upon the *Platonick* way, and aſſign the production of all things to that exuberant *fulneſs of life* in the Deity which through the bleſſed neceſſity and conſtraint of his moſt communicative nature emptied itſelf into all *poſſibilities* of *Being*, as into ſo many capable receptacles, you muſt then pronounce her exiſtence in a ſenſe neceſſary, and after a ſort coeternal with God. But if ſuch expreſſions ſeem too bold, and the heats of an *Enthuſiaſtic Fancy*, take that more probable *hypotheſis* which is built upon the more conceivable Attributes of God, his infinite *goodneſs* and benignity armed with equal *power*, and directed by no leſs *wiſdom*, beſides which nothing can be thought on to fit one for action; and then aſk yourſelf, whether if the ſubject in queſtion be capable of exiſting and enjoying ſome part of that infinite *goodneſs*,

neſs, it be not evident from thoſe attributes that it will be made to exiſt; that which is infinitely good as certainly doing by a *Logical neceſſity* every thing that is good, (no other attribute gainſaying) as infinite fire will neceſſarily burn whatever is combuſtible if put to it. Wherefore unleſs God act, by ſuch arbitary humours as we mortal men are aſhamed of as weakneſſes and imperfections in ourſelves, there is no doubt to be made but that this concluſion is true, That the ſouls of men did exiſt and act before this preſent world was fitted for their habitation, at leaſt before they were born upon earth. I have heard ſome men ſeriouſly profeſs, that there was a light and power in this argument far more vigorous and convincing to their minds, than in the plaineſt demonſtration in *Euclid*'s *Elements*. But yet they wondered not that others were not moved by it, becauſe it required a *peculiar diſpoſition of ſpirit* to feel the *force* of it. For there are *Moral* axioms *noematically* true as well as *Geometrical:* and as a man, to whom the *common notions* of *Geometry* appear not certain, muſt neceſſarily be inſenble of the evidence of any *propoſition* in that ſcience; ſo will it happen to him whoſe ſoul is ſo much out of her natural order, as to have loſt, or dull'd, or ſilenc'd by ſome means or other her diſcriminative ſenſe of what is good, worthy, congruous and decorous; all argumentations proceeding upon thoſe κοιναι εννοιαι thoſe *congenite* notices of a diviner ſenſe, which to others are demonſtrations, will affect him no more than an *ape* is taken with the *air* of *moral* beauty.

2. The actions of providence will not otherwiſe correſpond to thoſe holy attributes in

the Deity, *Righteouſneſs* and *Benignity*, according to which he governs and orders the affairs of all the world. This argument he makes uſe of two ways in his book againſt *Celſus*, and in his Περι αρχων, *viz.* in reſpect to the *place* and *time* wherein we are born, and of the *temper* and *diſpoſition* of the *body* wherewith we are born. As to the *firſt* of theſe, there is no man doubts but that education, inſtitution and company are of wonderful moment to the making us good or bad. For it is manifeſt enough, that few are born into this world in any higher condition than a *poſſibility* (as I may ſo ſpeak) or *capability* of being made good and virtuous; which capability is perfected and actuated by good inſtruction and wholeſome precepts aſſiduouſly inculcated to us, and by exhibiting and commending to us daily examples of virtue and honeſty: ſo that when or where either is wanting, or of little credit and eſteem, or the contrary more in uſe and practice, there ſeems little leſs than a neceſſity of our running into all wickedneſs and vice. And if we call to mind the ſad accounts we have met withal in hiſtory, of times and places almoſt all the world over-run with all manner of barbarity and luſt, adopted even into their laws, and practiſed in their moſt ſolemn religions, how can we but think that the ſoul then and there born and living is inevitably condemned to all iniquity and impiety? What father will care for inſtructing his children in ſuch things as are of no uſe and ſmall regard in the place he lives in; eſpecially when they will certainly unlearn what he teaches them, by the ſtronger and more pleaſing impreſſions of publick practice? And indeed what father will be fit to teach them ſuch things, who himſelf hath all his life-long in all probability done the contrary, being carried

carried away in his younger years, as his children are now, by the popular ſtream of his country's vices? Certainly there is very little likelihood he ſhould prove a benign, loving, compaſſionate, or a juſt and upright man, who by the laws of the city where he was born is eſpecially train'd up in his earlieſt years to the ferity and rage of war, and the ſleights of theft and cozenage.

It would be very eaſy for me to be copious in this argument: The hiſtories of all countries of old, all the apologies and diſputations of the primitive *Fathers* againſt the *Gentiles*, the later deſcriptions of the religions and manners of ſeveral barbarous and idolatrous parts of the world not long ſince diſcovered or viſited, would afford me too plentiful matter to fill up a very ſad catalogue of all manner of iniquity, which hath and doth ſtill reign amongſt them with little or no controul. For God therefore to ſend out of his pure and holy hands an immaculate ſoul, capable of living elſe-where, and fit for all virtue and heavenly wiſdom, leſt the luſt of two brutiſh perſons poſſibly ſhould come to nothing, and condemn it to an habitation in ſuch parts of the earth where reigns nothing but groſs ignorance and vice, by which ſhe cannot fail without a miracle to be over-born (having ſuch a principle in her vivid and vigorous, to which thoſe brutiſh depravaties are natural and hugely pleaſing, and that better principle of life which ſhould defend her from them being ſcarce in a poſſibility of being awakened into any conſiderable degree of power and energy in ſuch an education, and ſuch converſe, and amongſt ſuch examples as are above deſcribed) what is this, ſays the *Father*, but to betray his own offspring (for he is the Father of ſpirits) unto unavoidable miſery,

and

and to put off the chief excellencies of his moſt bleſſed nature, *goodneſs* and *righteouſneſs*, and to govern the world with leſs juſtice than an ordinary upright man would do? You may, if you pleaſe, taking occaſion from what hath been ſaid, carry this *firſt* part of his argument from Providence further, and enquire how it came to paſs that ſo many whole nations, both of old and at this preſent day, were ſo over-run with all kind of barbarity, ferity, and beſtial luſt, ſo utterly eſtranged from the knowledge of God and the love of virtue, ſo abuſed and tyranized over by the accurſed rebels of the *Aiery Principality*, the kingdom of darkneſs, laſtly, ſo quite eſtranged from themſelves and human nature, that they ſeem to have left themſelves nothing whereby they might be diſtinguiſh'd from downright brutes ſave ſpeech, and a ſomething larger and more methodical wit and craft to compaſs the ſatisfaction of their degenerate appetites. Truly, *Sir*, if you would form the *Idea* of human perfection in no greater glory, or ſet the attainments of a reaſonable Soul at no higher pitch than the certain knowledge of ſome of your own virtuous friends will warrant you to do, in whom (as you have oft with joy and wonder related to me) appears ſo pure and angelical an underſtanding, ſo firm and radicated a life of all holineſs and ſanctity, love and hearty benignity to all the world, of juſtice and purity, and whatever is truly divine; and if you then conſider the vaſt diſſimilitude between this *Idea* and the ſpirit of ſo many whole nations in the world; I make no doubt but you will ſay, that the life of man upon earth is too ſhort, ſo far to abuſe the capacity of what he might come to, as to put him in ſo low

a degree of degeneracy as thoſe forlorn people contentedly live in. But not only the degree of their apoſtacy from a divine and intellectual life, and of their immerſion in the brutiſh and ſenſual, is ſo wonderful, but their *continuance* alſo inthat wretched eſtate for ſo many ages together, without any remarkable appearance of providence for their deliverance, nay rather with her perfect leaving them to the inſolence, ſubtilty, and conduct of the Devil, is a *Phænomenon* inexplicable without the *Origenian hypotheſis*. For ſince whole nations and their continuance are but the *Aggregate* of ſingle ſouls born into the world in ſucceſſive generations, and ſince every particular Soul comes into ſuch or ſuch parts of the earth with ſo vaſt diſadvantages, as is above declared: if beſide this the crafty and malicious ſerpent hath ſuch free ſcope to tamper with them, who at the beſt are very deceiveable; it can ſeem to you little leſs than *neceſſary* that they ſhould be wrought into that enormous lapſe from God, which hiſtory and too ſad experience witneſs they are and have been. Now ſince the two great and moſt proper objects of the gracious and beneficient *providence* of God are the *virtuous* and *faultleſly calamitous* (of which latter order thoſe miſerable nations would in great meaſure be, if ſouls did not *pre-exiſt*) who can doubt but that *providence* would very early have appear'd for their reſcue, or rather taken ſuch care that they ſhould not ſo much have needed any extraordinary aſſiſtance from her? But ſince we ſee *ſhe* hath done neither, and yet are ſure that all her ways are *gracious* and *equal*, it will be very hard for us to keep ourſelves from concluding, That all thoſe wretched Souls had of old, by their long *revolt* from

from God and the Laws of his righteous Kingdom, highly deſerved this ſcourge from him, to be ſo put out of his care, as it were, and given up to the barbarous domination of the *Devil*, the *head* and Prince of the unrighteous and rebellious empire of darkneſs; and whom they by choice and affection fell off to in other regions of the world, that him and his tyranny they ſhould here upon earth ſtill ſuffer, whether with or againſt their wills. And ſince there is poſſibility and hope that the preſent ſad part of the *Drama* may end, and a more chearful *Cataſtrophe* cloſe up all, the *benignity* of providence may in due time be as illuſtrious as her *juſtice* hath been conſpicuous.

I know there are many men who, part out of piety and humility, part from a parrot-like talking ſuch words as their books and education have taught them, can with very great eaſe and ſatisfaction of mind reſolve all into the *pleaſure* and *Sovereignty* of God, who being the Creator and Lord of all men, may (they ſay) diſpoſe of them how and where he pleaſes. But it would be very well if they were as zealous patrons of the more excellent *attributes* of God, as they are peremptory aſſertors of his *abſolute Will* and *Power*. For then they would both render his exiſtence and government in the world ſo deſireable to all men, that none but the extremely-guilty would wiſh either his *not-being*, or his *non-concerning* himſelf in the affairs of men; and alſo cut off many ſcandalous occaſions of *Atheiſm* and *Epicuriſm*, and ſpoil the *profeſſed* of thoſe execrable myſteries of thoſe over-plauſible pretences they now have and craftily manage againſt the truth.

For

For tell me, *Sir*, if the frame of the bodies or the paſſions and affections of men or beaſts in whole regions of the earth, or of many in every region, were ſuch as did plainly ſerve for nothing but to incommodate or cruciate them, or make them an inevitable prey to others; could you with any reaſonable confidence affirm, that the goodneſs and providence of a *wiſe mind* did preſide over their generations? or think you you could reaſonably ſatisfy the exceptions of an *Atheiſt* or an *Epicurean* taken from ſuch manifeſt *Phænomena*, by ſaying God *might* make them as he pleaſed which were his own voluntary handy-work? I am glad for my own particular all things are ſo made, that there is no occaſion given for any ſuch exception; for, believe me, if there was, I know not how I ſhould behave myſelf in ſo croſs a rencounter. And may not theſe men with the ſame plauſibility of reaſon maintain the ſame concluſion from the odd frame of things in the *moral* world, were it ſuch as the deniers of *pre-exiſtence* muſt needs make it? I think they might do it with far juſter reaſon; foraſmuch as a man is a far nobler creature, and the intereſt of his mind and immortal Spirit much greater and more laſting, and therefore a more proper object of the care and providence of God, if any providence there be. Or are they ſo little peremptory in their aſſaults as to be beaten off by ſuch painted fire, ſuch hurtleſs *lambent* flames as are caſt againſt them by thoſe who oppoſe to their arguments nothing but the *will* and *ſovereignty* of God? For they profeſs themſelves well aſſured that if God be at all, he is infinitely *good* and *wiſe* as well as powerful and uncontroul-

able; and therefore by the neceſſary conſequences of reaſon, wherever he is pretended by any to intermeddle either as to the *making* or *diſpoſing* of any thing, they expect to find the impreſſes and indications of thoſe attributes: but if in ſtead thereof they find all things quite contrary, it is not in their power to think that God hath had any thing to do there. But whatever ruin their argumentations from ſuch ſubſtantial grounds may threaten to the ill-built fabrick of ordinary *Theology*, the *houſe of Wiſdom* and truth, which hath made *pre-exiſtence* one of her *pillars*, ſtands as firm as a mountainous *Pyramid*; and by that *hypotheſis* the great *Phenomenon* of providence we have been ſpeaking of is clear and righteous. Neither hath the *Atheiſt* or *Epicurean* any thing conſiderable to ſay againſt the truth of it, either as it is a ſingle propoſition by itſelf, or as an *hypotheſis* to ſalve the *Phænomena* of providence. Which ſtreights of theirs they plainly enough confeſs by their either only gravely ſmiling at it as an extravagance, or with a more ſolemn brow chaſtiſing it as a dangerous *Paradox*. And truly a dangerous one it is to their pretended and boaſted *wiſdom:* but to the genuine plants of heavenly truth and divine knowledge 'tis as agreeable and ſalutary as ſhowers and ſun-beams are to the growing ſpring.

The *ſecond* part of the *Father's* argument from providence is much the ſame as the firſt, *mutatis mutandis*. For the experience of moſt men can bear witneſs that there are not ſtronger allurements from *without* to all manner of viciouſneſs, than we find incitations to the ſame from our own *intrinſick* conſtitution: which (according to the common *hypotheſis*) is not properly our fault, nor any fruit of it, nor was it in our power to prevent

prevent it; yet we are ſo fatally intangled in it, that it is next to a miracle to rid ourſelves in any good meaſure of its chains. Is not the world diſordered, and ſociety poiſoned, and mens own particular peace and honour miſerably violated with the baleful effects of the four elements of our *terreſtrial* compoſition? whilſt ſome live even in this world in a perpetual *fire*, and are tormented before their time through the wrathfulneſs and ſtrifes, contentiouſneſs and injurious zeal which their *Choler* kindles in them; others on the contrary are drowned in ſottiſhneſs and ſtupidity and an utter ineptneſs to all things worthy of a man, by the overflowing of ſtupifying *Phlegm*; a third ſort toſſed about like feathers with light-mindedneſs and admiration of trifles, or wafted into the foul lake of bodily pleaſures by the guſts of reeking *Blood*; a fourth conſumed by that ſlow-devouring *Demogorgon* in the earthy *Melancholy*, in which lodge anxious fear, dark ſuſpicion, and fretting envy. And though you poſſibly may have heard ſome men talk of *liberty* and *free-will* and a ſovereign power in us to keep all theſe rebellious humours in good order, and that with much eaſe, if we would but give our minds to it; yet if you but conſider whence it is that they talk in that high ſtrain, you will begin to think they reckon without their hoſt and againſt experience. Such men have a Sort of adverſaries, who from the aſſurance of their very ſenſes that there is a great *lapſe* and degeneracy in univerſal mankind, do without all ceremony bluntly caſt the cauſe upon *God*, or at beſt aſſign ſuch a reaſon for it as their *Antagoniſts* think comes to the ſame; who therefore out of an abhorrency to ſuch blaſphemy (as they call it) think it better and more pious

to deny the truth of a manifeſt obſervation than to make God the author of ſo calamitous a *Phænomenon.* Where by the way you may obſerve that both ſides by their earneſt contention, making good *half* of their reſpective opinions, have to the free enquirer and lover of truth facilitated his finding out the true cauſe, which neither contradicts experience, nor is injurious to the glory of the *Almighty.* But granting to theſe contenders for *Free-will* that ſomething of what they plead for is true (as indeed it cannot be denied) I yet would aſk them, whether or no, the condition of our nature conſidered, the ſtrong inclinations in us naturally to that which is evil, and theſe ſtrengthened and further confirmed for ſeveral years before we can come to have any conſiderable uſe of our reaſon, or arrive to any command over ourſelves; laſtly, the way and manner how the elections of our *will* are performed, which we never find *free*, where there is a *cuſtom* or *paſſion* againſt it, and how corporeal motions determine the thoughts and paſſions of our mind, I aſk them whether, theſe things being conſidered, it be not hundreds to one odds that we ſhall chuſe the ways of vice rather than virtue. Or let the diſproportion be as little as they can with any colour pretend, they cannot clear the goodneſs and rectitude of divine *providence* by their *hypotheſis*, which thruſts pure and immaculate and moſt innocent ſpirits into ſo great danger of being defiled and corrupted by the paſſions of the *body*, and of ſeverely ſuffering for it hereafter. But for my own part, I think the obſervation of their adverſaries is much the truer, that the diſproportion is exceeding great; for ſince the ways of holineſs and virtue are ſo full of peace and unſpeakable contentment, and ſhine with ſo raviſhing

viſhing and irreſiſtible pulchritude to prepared minds, and do ſo perfectly correſpond to all the ſenſes of ſo happy a temper, that we are fully aſſured our Soul is then as ſhe ſhould be and in conjunction with her moſt proper good; I cannot ſee why men ſhould univerſally take the contrary courſe, and that with ſo much paſſion as they do, jearing at thoſe who have made the better choice, as mad-men or fools, if there was any *liberty* in them worth ſpeaking of to virtue or piety. 'Tis true indeed, there is great variety as to *degree* in the backwardneſs of men to goodneſs and virtue, and proneneſs to that which is evil; yet thoſe who have the care and nurture of youth, fathers, ſchoolmaſters, and tutors, do with one conſent affirm, that they frequently have ſome in their charge, who from their earlieſt years are of ſo inexpugnable a propenſion to that which is naught, ſo wretchleſs and inſenſible of all wholeſome counſels, and have their eyes ſo perfectly ſeal'd up and their hearts ſo frozen to all impreſſions of virtue and ſobriety, that you may as well read lectures of temperance to a goat or a boar, and as ſucceſfully teach goodneſs, and pity and kindneſs to a bear robbed of her whelps or tiger inraged with hunger, as think to faſten any ſuch things upon their blind and obdurate minds. Whence is this ſtrange *Phænomenon?* If the ſoul was not in the world before it was born upon earth, it is not conceivable how it ſhould in ſo little a time contract ſo peremptory an affection to vice amidſt thoſe continual chidings and reproofs, thoſe ſharp and painful corrections, thoſe ſeveral ways of ignominious puniſhments it meets with, thoſe advantageous repreſentations made to it of that which is

good

good and laudable, thoſe many and earneſt invitations and allurements to embrace it, with all other methods of a good and prudent inſtitution. That it comes pure and undefiled out of the hands of the Creator all grant; and be this pureneſs what it will, whether with or without thoſe *natural notions* of what is *good* and *honeſt*, the buſineſs will be much the ſame. For if the *latter* way be the truth, even this negative purity will leave it in an indifferency to virtue or vice; and therefore if its firſt precepts and earlieſt inculcations be good and virtuous, it would be formed unto virtue; which is ſo far from happening to ſome (though the very ſame inſtruction to others proves ſucceſsful) that they on the contrary, impatient of every curb and rein, and deaf to all calls and charms, run headlong into all iniquity. If the *former* way be true, it would be ſtill more wonderful how its firſt-appearing inclinations ſhould ſo eagerly carry it to that which is vicious, contrary to the poſitive reſtraint of its inward light. But if they ſay (as they generally do) that the ſoul itſelf is pure and immaculate, but that it contracts this unreclaimable proclivity to vice from the body it is put into, beſide the ignorance they diſcover by ſo ſaying in the ſpeculation of things, in joining ſuch ill-agreeing mates together into one vital compoſition, where *Sympathy* and *Congruity* is the only *vinculum*, the *Father* aſks them how it is conſiſtent with the *goodneſs* and *righteouſneſs* of God, the bleſſed ſpring of all virtue and holineſs, and tender lover of all his creatures, to put ſuch innocent ſouls into ſuch foul and untamed *bodies*, which ſo fatally and neceſſarily hurry them to that which alone of all things in the world he diſapproves of, and which he knows

knows will be their utter bane and miſerable ruin. And therefore upon the whole of this *ſecond* part of his argument from *providence* he concludes, that ſince ſo great a part of our pitiable bondage to vice and paſſion in the judgment of all ſides proceeds from theſe *bodies* of ours, if the ſoul was merely paſſive in being born into this world, and *was* not before it was born here, much of the calamity it ſuffers from vice, for which it muſt ſuffer more hereafter, muſt in his judgment be caſt upon God; which he thinks is impious to affirm, and utterly contradictious to his holy attributes.

A *third* argument of his I find in St. *Jerome*, from the miſbecomingneſs of the contrary poſition, which makes the bleſſed *Majeſty* of heaven and earth diligently wait upon unclean embraces. Which monſtrous *indecorum* though *coarſer ſpirits are not ſenſible of*, and think they have anſwered the argument by thoſe mean compariſons of the ſun's ſhining upon dunghills as well as flowery meads, and ſtollen ſeed's growing as well as that which the ſower came juſtly by; yet it was exceedingly harſh to the more *delicate ſenſe* of *Origen's* mind, and not to be put off by ſuch ſlight and ill-fitting ſimilitudes. 'Tis a ſhrewd ſign *that* ſoul is much diſcompoſed in her *Harmonical nature*, who hath ſo far loſt her ſenſe of *proportionateneſs* and *congruity*, as either not to think this is a very humble office to the ſupreme *Deity*; or if it be ſo, not to feel in herſelf a great reluctance to the making God ſo particular an executer of it. If they imagin'd all things were made and ordered by ſuch ſettled laws of nature as might in ſome ſenſe be called neceſſary, this *indecorum* would be more tolerable; but to make God work all things in an

an expreſs and voluntary way, and with his own hands, as it were, and yet to fancy ſo *ſpecial* an interpoſal of his will and power in ſo abhorred an occaſion, is to be very bold with the ſovereign *Majeſty* on high, and to make him do that which they themſelves, were it in their power, would be aſhamed to do. And what contrariety would it be to any of the divine attributes, or what loſs to the world, if God did not appear in ſuch unlawful inchoations of life, but let them come to naught in the end, as they were without his approbation begun? But the true judgment of this argument, as I intimated above, is the *inward touch of a man's mind*; which in you I know to be ſo comely and graceful, that at the firſt propoſal you felt the force of it, and need not that I further inlarge upon it.

4. Though Scripture no where particularly and plainly teaches us when the ſoul was *firſt* produced and came into Being, yet there are ſome paſſages in it which favour *its pre-exiſtence*. *I have glorified thee on earth, I have finiſhed the work thou gaveſt me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with that glory I had with thee before the world was.* In which *text* theſe two things are plainly enough intimated, the exiſtence of the *Subject* of this glory prayed for before the world was, and an interciſion of this glory for a-while and recuperation of it again; the former whereof though it be true of the Divine λογος, yet the latter is incompetible to him. And the event plainly ſhews the *ſubject* of this glory; for he that humbled himſelf to the death of the croſs, was exalted by God to be the Sovereign *prince* of men and angels; and he that was made in the like-

likeneſs of man or ſinful fleſh in a *vile body*, was inveſted with power to change our vile bodies into the ſimilitude of his *glorious* body. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father. His diſciples ſaid unto him, Lo, now ſpeakeſt thou plainly, and ſpeakeſt no parable.*

And certainly ſomething in favour of this opinion may be made of that queſtion of the diſciples to our Saviour concerning the man that was born blind; for either he approved of the common opinion as true, or at leaſt thought it very harmleſs if falſe, ſince having ſo fair an occaſion of rectifying the common belief, he yet ſaid nothing againſt it. I know indeed that the *Silence* of ſcripture, and the arguments from thence which they call *negative*, are eſteemed of little force in diſputation unleſs in ſome certain caſes. But he that ſhall ſeriouſly conſider how great a change does neceſſarily follow in the whole frame of chriſtian religion from the beginning to the end of it, by the taking in or leaving out this opinion of *pre-exiſtence*, may poſſibly be induced to think that our Saviour's ſaying nothing in ſo apt an occaſion is one of thoſe caſes wherein *Silence* is almoſt as argumentative as a potive approbation.

Parables likewiſe will not be taken for arguments; which is no ill *rule*, if underſtood of the minute circumſtance of them, and of ſuch parts as the *decorum* of an *apologue* requires; but certainly the *whole* will argue as well as inſtruct. But I lay no ſtreſs upon them, becauſe they may have other true and ſober interpretations; yet I thought good to caſt them in for variety ſake,

that you may ſee how congruouſly they may be applied to the doctrine we are upon. The prodigal ſon's leaving his father you know is deſcribed by his *going into a far country*, and there waſting his ſubſtance with riotous living; and in his return his father ſays of him, this my ſon *was dead*, but is *alive again*, was loſt, but is found. *The Son of man is come* [from heaven] *to ſave that which was loſt. If a man have an hundred ſheep, and one of them go aſtray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and ſeeketh that which is gone aſtray? For ye were as ſheep going aſtray, but are now returned unto the ſhepherd and biſhop of your ſouls. I am the good ſhepherd, not an hireling whoſe* own *the ſheep are not.* You may conſider theſe places alſo, though they do not all belong to this head of *Parables: I am not ſent, but* εις τα προβατα τα απολωλοτα—*and not for that nation only, but that he ſhould gather together in one* τα τεκνα τυ Θευ τα διεσκορπισμενα—*and having made peace by the blood of his croſs, by him to reconcile all things unto himſelf, whether things* in heaven, *or things* in earth. *Dearly beloved brethren, I beſeech you as* ſtrangers *and* pilgrims *abſtain from fleſhly luſts which war againſt the Soul*——*and confeſſed that they were* ſtrangers *and* pilgrims upon earth. This may ſerve to let you ſee that the *father* had very probable reaſons for his *ſecond* opinion.

His *third* is this, That theſe *pre-exiſting ſouls* through their fault and negligence became inhabitants of the earth in *terreſtrial* bodies.

Which opinion he grounds upon theſe conſiderations.

In that long chain of life and being propagated from the higheſt to the loweſt of all, from the moſt *incorporeal* Deity to *Matter* itſelf, 'tis not to be wondered at, nay, 'tis neceſſary, that many of

of the *intermediate* eſſences ſhould partake of both the *extremes*, and ſo there be brought into light *Spirits incorporate*. But ſince few ſpirits after the *Firſt* and *Beſt* are of immutable purity, and ſince every different degree of their changeable purity is proportion'd to a correſpondent degree of purity in matter, and ſince matter is actually exiſtent in the world according to all degrees of purity, 'tis not to wondered at neither that the ſame individual ſpirit, or ſame order of ſpirits ſhould be ſometimes united with one ſort of matter, ſometimes with another. But whatever happened to them afterwards, through the mutability of their nature, we may be aſſured from that *infinite goodneſs* which produced them, that they were at firſt joined to the pureſt matter, and placed in the beſt regions of the world that the higheſt life and purity of eſſence they then had made them fit for. The *ſouls* of men are *one* order of theſe *eſſentially-incorporate ſpirits*, as both their deep immerſion into *terreſtrial* matter, the modification of all their operations by it, and the *heavenly body* promiſed us in the goſpel as the higheſt perfection of our recovered nature, do ſufficiently argue. And therefore if our ſouls did exiſt before they appeared inhabitants of the earth, the ſediment of the corporeal world, they did exiſt in a purer element, to which an higher degree of life, and purer operations, and conſequently greater happineſs, did belong. Who then ſhould turn them out of that better condition, in which the order and courſe of nature and the internal congruity of their own eſſence had placed them? Certainly not *he* whoſe overflowing goodneſs firſt brought them into life and being, and who no doubt in the firſt

moment of their exiſtence ſet them to exerciſe thoſe powers of life he had given them, in thoſe parts of the world as were moſt advantageous for the happineſs they were capable of. And though they ſhould through the lapſability of their nature fall from this eminent pitch of primitive felicity to a ſtate leſs happy and perfect; yet this ſtate being not the loweſt and worſt of all, and that ſame *goodneſs* which firſt made them, and always governs them, being undiminiſhable, it is almoſt as harſh to think he would precipitate them from this ſomething-better condition into that which is the moſt miſerable of all, as that he did originally create them in ſuch a condition as was far worſe than what he then judged them capable of. And to think that any other external cauſe could do it by force and violence is very *unphiloſophical*, ſince there is an inward maturation of *vital congruity* to be firſt wrought before they be ſo much as capable of uniting with this or that element, much leſs of living in it as a ſeat and habitation of a durable life; beſides, it ſeems inconſiſtent with that moſt wiſe and gracious *providence* which governs the world, that any thing ſhould have a power of diſpoſing of any being in it παρα την αξιαν. What then remains but that through the faulty and negligent uſe of themſelves, whilſt they were in ſome better condition of life, they rendered themſelves leſs pure in the whole extent of their powers both *intellectual* and *animal*, and ſo by degrees became *diſpoſed* for the ſuſception of ſuch a degree of *corporeal* life as was leſs pure indeed than the former, but exactly anſwerable to their preſent diſpoſition of ſpirit; ſo that after certain

periods

periods of time they might become far leſs fit to actuate any ſort of matter than the *terreſtrial?* and being originally made with a capacity to join with this too, and in it exerciſe the powers and functions of life, it ſeems neceſſary according to the courſe of nature that they ſhould ſink into it, and ſo appear *terreſtrial men.* And that this is a very probable cauſe of their becoming inhabitants of the earth, the *learned father* thinks cannot be doubted, if we conſider the neceſſary mutability in created eſſences, the *freedom of will* in human ſouls, and the great ſympathy there is betwixt the *parts* of the ſoul, (for he, according to the *Platonick* doctrine, thinks the ſoul *heterogeneous*, and nothing is more eaſy than to prove that it is ſo.) For as he often inculcates, goodneſs and truth are not eſſential or *ſubſtantial* in theſe inferior natures, ſo as that they ſhould be in a perpetual contemplation of them, and under that moſt happy conſtraint of never loſing the ſight of their glorious forms, and of never ſwerving from their laws; but do in a more accidental way belong unto them, and are efficacious in them only upon certain terms and conditions. From which imperfection of their nature ariſes the αὐτεξουσιον, freedom of will (for this in ſome ſenſe is no perfection) and by the too great liberty of that power it eaſily happens that they obſerve not thoſe terms and conditions, being drawn away from a preſs and careful attendance to them by converting to the delightful motions of their *congenite* bodies: which delight is both natural and in ſome degrees allowed; but all corporeal pleaſure having ſome thing of confuſion and diſturbance in it, together with a ſtrong *magical* devocation of the animadverſion to the ſenſe of it, they might

in

in this dark huddle eaſily loſe the ſight of thoſe bounds and limits beyond which they ought not to proceed in the enjoyment of thoſe pleaſures they reap from corporeal life. It is very hard for the ſoul under the preſent actual fruition of what is delightful to it, and meeting with nothing in this its freer indulgency, which by its ſharpneſs may check it, not to be tempted a little and a little further, it ſeeling a freedom accompanying this its ſecret deſire and inward preſages all along. This unwarrantable liberty is not at firſt ſo free while the principle of the more divine and intellectual life is more intire: but this by little and little is weakened by thoſe permiſſions we make unto ourſelves in favour of our natural propenſions to corporeal joy; and ſo the ſuperior life extinguiſhing by degrees, and the inferior more eagerly kindling, we ruſh at laſt without bounds and meaſure to take our fill of thoſe pleaſures which the lawleſs motions of the body we are then united with offer to our corrupted ſenſe. But whatever aberrations we make from the laws of intellectual life, the ill effect of them is not confined to that chief and *principal part* of our ſoul wherein that *life* is ſeated, but deſcends from thence and ſpreads its impure contagion through all the *ſeats* of inferior life, by reaſon of that cloſe continuity which is in all the parts of the ſoul. And whatever happens to its principal part as the *centre* of all the reſt, does in a correſpondent manner affect theſe which *ray* from that: for as theſe in their firſt *emanation* were determinately ſuch or ſuch only, becauſe *that* from whom they proceeded was of ſuch or ſuch a degree of purity and eſſential power; ſo in all the after-mutations which happen

pen they conſtantly *ſympathize* with one another. For if the *inferior parts* of the ſoul deſtin'd unto her meaner functions do ſo punctually obey the moſt ſtill and ſilent volition or imagination of that which is *ſupreme*, as we plainly find they do in paſſions and ſpontaneous motion; what wonder is it if the preſent frame, habit and temper of that *ſupreme part* (which is certainly more powerful than a ſingle tranſient command) does mould and form them into a ſuitable temper with itſelf? And therefore if that *central* part by forſaking the laws of a better life become ſo impure, that her operations in this degenerate condition would not exceed thoſe which may be expected from an *underſtanding* in conjunction with *earthly* matter; the parts *derivative* will neceſſarily be changed into a correſpondent feculency, and ſo the whole ſoul will ſink into *terreſtrial* matter, for which alone it is now fit, and by her *ſeminal reaſons* proper to this ſtate, ſhape it into the fabrick of a *terreſtrial man*.

2. And the *Father* further thinks we ought not to wonder at any thing in this procedure, if we do but read and underſtand what the holy ſcripture teaches us of the ſinning angels, that they kept not their primitive excellency but left their proper habitations in the regions of heavenly light, and are therefore bound εν τωδε τω ταρταρω with the chains of fuliginous air. For what greater wonder is it that *aereal genii* become *terreſtrial men*, than *æthereal* angels *aereal dæmons*? But this parity of reaſon is not all the aſſiſtance which *Origen* conceived the ſcripture afforded him in this aſſertion. For the ſacred ſtory of *man* in *Geneſis* plainly deſcribes a tranſgreſſion for which he was turn'd out of *paradiſe*, and became mortal, as the text ſays. Which hiſtory St. *Paul* carries

carries further in his *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*, and ſays, that *as by one man ſin entered into the world, and by ſin death and mortality; ſo alſo did this death and mortality go through all men, becauſe* or *ſo far as all have ſinned*; or in his own words more elegantly, ωςπερ δι ενος ανθρωπυ η αμαρτια εις τον κοσμον εισηλθεν, και δια της αμαρτιας ο θανατος και υτως εις παντας ανθρωπυς ο θανατος διηλθεν εφ' ω παντες ημαρτον. And again to the *Corinth.* *As by man death*——and, *As in Adam all die*—By which places it appears that *Adam* ſinned, and as a conſequent thereof became *mortal*; his ſons alſo ſinned, and mortality pervaded them too. Now who this *mortal Adam* is whoſe image all that bear are likewiſe mortal, the *apoſtle* tells us in the ſame chapter, to wit, chap. 15. The firſt man is of the earth, earthy, ανθρωπος εκ γης, χοικος. Therefore we all become χοικοι or *terreſtrial* men by ſin. But ſince we are ſuch from our firſt coming into this world, and the fault muſt needs be before the conſequents of it, that ſin and tranſgreſſion by which we became ſuch muſt be look'd for higher or in ſome former ſtate. I know this concluſion would not be thought by many men rightly deduc'd from theſe places of ſcripture; but this ought to be no prejudice againſt it, if you but remember that the gainſayers are of two ſorts of *divines*; the one thoſe who deny the *original* and general depravation of mankind, the other thoſe who aſcribe all to the will and ſovereignty, or miſtaken juſtice of God, upon occaſion of the perſonal miſcarriage of the *firſt man* that dwelt upon this earth. The firſt of theſe do manifeſt violence (in my apprehenſion) to ſcripture, and contradict experience: the latter groſsly pervert the nature of things, and rudely diſhonour the divine attributes; as might with much eaſe be ſhewn, if I thought it neceſ-

to your ſagacious judgment.

Such were the ſentiments of the venerable *Origen* on the ſubject of pre-exiſtence, as appears from the *Account* given above. And ſhall a doctrine ſo powerfully defended by a father of the church, eminent for piety, penetration and learning, which has reaſon, antiquity and, *rationally* interpreted, ſcripture for its ſupport, which reflects ſuch a luſtre too on the attributes of the deity, and the cauſe of our moſt holy religion; ſhall a doctrine I ſay, ſo circumſtanced, ſo ſeemingly intereſting and important, be doomed to oblivion in deference to popular prejudices, and to, (what I am ſorry to ſay are the characteriſtics of the preſent age,) a deſpicable contractedneſs of thought, and a contempt for, or which is equally unworthy, a ſupine indifference to an inveſtigation of truths, in compariſon of which all others are meer futilities, I mean, truths theological? No! rather let me hope that ſome at laſt will ariſe who, actuated with a laudable zeal for the honour of their religion and their God will recommend it to the world as an appeal to *reaſon* and *revelation* which is at leaſt intitled to a ſerious and impartial *examination**.

---

* Objections to the father's opinion are ſtated and ſufficiently anſwered by the author of the *Account*, and the annotator on Glanville's Lux Orientalis; which laſt book the reader cannot peruſe too attentively.

FINIS.